

IRAQ SPEAKS

Documents on the Gulf Crisis

by

Saddam Hussein

Taha Yasin Ramadan

Tariq 'Aziz

Dr. Sa'dun Hammadi

Latif Jasim

Saadi Mahdi Salih

Compiled by Fred Moore

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword on Translation by Fred Moore

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>1 "The National Potential and International Politics" Excerpt from a Statement by Saddam Hussein to Iraqi Ambassadors in Western Europe and Japan, 12 June 1975</p> <p>1 Excerpt from an interview given by Saddam Hussein to Egyptian journalist Sakina al-Sadat on 19 January 1977</p> <p>1 "The National Declaration" announced by Saddam Hussein on 8 February 1980</p> <p>3 Speech at Baghdad Summit by Saddam Hussein 30 May 1990</p> <p>3 Excerpt from speech by Saddam Hussein marking the Revolution's 22nd Anniversary on 15 July 1990</p> <p>5 Excerpts from a letter to Arab League Secretary General Chedli Klibi by Tariq 'Aziz, Deputy Prime Minister & Minister of Foreign Affairs, on 16 July 1990</p> <p>9 Excerpts from the Minutes of the Audience given by President Saddam Hussein to April Glaspie, US Ambassador to Iraq, on 25 July 1990</p> <p>9 Excerpt from the "Victory Day Message Commemorating 8 August 1988" by Saddam Hussein on 7 August 1990</p> <p>10 Initiatives for the Maintenance of Peace in the Middle East offered by Saddam Hussein on 12 August 1990</p> <p>11 Open letter to U.S. President George Bush from Saddam Hussein, dated 16 August 1990</p> <p>12 Open letter to the families of foreigners in Iraq from Saddam Hussein, dated 19 August 1990</p> | <p>14 Open letter to U.S. President George Bush from Saddam Hussein, dated 21 August 1990</p> <p>16 Excerpts from Saddam Hussein's remarks to British families detained by Iraq on 23 August 1990</p> <p>17 Letter to American people from Saadi Mahdi Salih, Speaker of the National Assembly, on 24 August 1990</p> <p>19 Remarks by Saddam Hussein during a second visit with some families detained by the Iraq on 28 August 1990</p> <p>24 Interview with Saddam Hussein by Dan Rather of CBS Television Network in Baghdad on 29 August 1990</p> <p>29 Excerpts from an interview with Saddam Hussein by Jesse Jackson, 31 August 1990</p> <p>34 Interview with Dr. Sa'dun Hammadi, Deputy Prime Minister and Revolution Command Council, on 1 September 1990</p> <p>36 "The Kuwait Question" by Tariq 'Aziz, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, on 4 September 1990</p> <p>43 Excerpts from interview with Tariq 'Aziz, Minister of Foreign Affairs, by Fu'ad Matar, editor of <i>Al-Tadamun</i>, on 14 September 1990</p> <p>48 Message of Peace to the American people from Saddam Hussein on 26 Sept. 1990</p> <p>56 Address to UN General Assembly by Tariq 'Aziz, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, delivered on his behalf by Ambassador Abdul Amir Al-Anbari, Permanent Representative of Iraq to the UN, on 4 October 1990</p> | <p>60 Interview with Latif Jasim, Minister of Culture and Information by a reporter for <i>Der Spiegel</i> on 8 October 1990</p> <p>62 Excerpts from message on Iraqi Child Day issued by Saddam Hussein on 12 October 1990</p> <p>64 Excerpts from interview with Dr. Sa'dun Hammadi, Deputy Prime Minister and Chair of the Economic Committee, and Revolution Command Council member, on 13 October 1990</p> <p>67 Excerpts from interview with Saddam Hussein by reporters Kentaro Hirayama and Masayoshi Terauchi for Japan's NHK General Television Network on 20 October 1990</p> <p>71 Speech to FOR Delegation by Saadi Mahdi Salih, Speaker of the Iraqi National Assembly, on 21 October 1990</p> | <p>75 Excerpts from an Interview with National Assembly Speaker Saadi Madhi Salih by Hamidah Na'na in October 1990</p> <p>75 Interview with Taha Yasin Ramadan, First Deputy Prime Minister and Revolution Command Council member by Hamidah Na'na in October 1990</p> <p>82 Letter to the U.N. Secretary-General from Mr. Tariq 'Aziz, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, dated 24 January 1991</p> <p>Appendix:</p> <p>85 United Nations Security Council Resolutions: 660, 661, 662, 664, 665, 666, 667, 670, 674, 677, and 678</p> <p>92 Some Information on Iraq</p> |
|---|--|--|---|

Foreword About The Translation

Translators always face a choice between two extremes: whether to give a word-for-word **literal translation** or an **interpretation** that may convey the intended meaning of a passage but without the word-for-word mapping. The speeches, interviews, letters, and documents that have been gathered for this book come from unofficial translations, often from spoken Arabic. (The translators are not identified.)

Each language enables a unique way of thinking. Arabic is a rich, poetic language with an abundant number of words suitable for communicating both precision and colorful shades of meaning. Colloquial Iraqi Arabic contains expressive idioms and metaphors. These rhetorical expressions are readily understood by Iraqi citizens, but may seem confusing or alarming to those unfamiliar with the culture. Finding an appropriate phrase for each of these in English is not always easy and there is a risk the meaning will be altered by any English idiomatic substitution. On the other hand, a literal translation results in an awkward sentence or stilted style.

The purpose of this book is to present the Iraqi point of view from Iraqi governmental officials. It is assumed that readers of this book are interested in understanding the **information content and message** which these Iraqi leaders want to convey. Therefore, these unrefined, semi-literal translations need to be studied and analyzed to comprehend the meaning intended. Occasionally the text may seem bit turgid, yet the very lack of grace and polish may assist one in focusing on getting at the meaning behind the words.

For sure, this book is not literature. It was compiled in haste as a selective, yet representative, sample of official Iraqi commentary on various aspects of the Gulf crisis. I obtained some speeches while I was in Iraq with the Fellowship of Reconciliation Peace Delegation in October 1990, some from the Iraqi Mission to the United Nations, and some from the *Daily Report on the Near East & South Asia* put out by the Foreign Broadcast Information Service which I cite as a secondary source.

Except for a few minor word changes to clarify sentences that were particularly awkward, the translations remain unaltered. I tape recorded, and later transcribed, the simultaneous English translation of the talk which the Speaker of the National Assembly delivered to the FOR Peace Delegation October 19, 1990. Except for this item, all the other documents are part of the public record in Arabic in Iraq to which scholars are referred for further clarification of any discrepancy.

— Fred Moore

"The National Potential and International Politics," excerpts from a speech by Saddam Hussein to Iraq Ambassadors in Western Europe and Japan on 12 June 1975

Oil for the United States is no longer a question of desire for self-sufficiency and the safeguarding of a strategic material, nor is it a form of gaining profit by exploitation only. It has become a decisive element in American global policies with particular effect on its relations with Western Europe and Japan. Hence, the United States will not be content with the present *status quo*, but will try to curtail influence of Europe in the oil affairs of this area and replace it with its own.

America and some European states will have the lion's share of the joint oil of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and other countries, so it is not like the liberated oil of Iraq, which we can sell in accordance with our policies and interests. The major share of the joint oil will be under long-term contracts which have this effect.

The United States and some Western European countries will have specific shares in proportion to their influence on the governments of the oil-producing states, something which will effect the relations between the United States and Europe. It will also affect the alliances which strengthen America's grip on Europe and Japan in a way that consolidates the US position and influence in world politics.

In discussing international politics, we must not forget the basic and decisive factor, namely, the will of the peoples. There are two approaches to international politics: the first ignores the effect of international politics on the Pan-Arab and national struggle, which is wrong, and the second makes the destiny of our Pan-Arab and national struggle a prisoner of international politics, which is a deviation. First and foremost, the will of the people has the decisive role in the fundamental directions of world politics, over and above other factors. If the balance is tipped occasionally in the other direction in certain circumstances and issues, this must not be taken as a general rule. On such a basis the effects of the American stand in the area should be examined. The question of what the future will bring is one in which the will of the people plays a crucial part. It may be that the future will favour the United States for some time, but in the longer term, the future will favour the peoples. Even within a limited perspective, there may be some surprises which will tip the balance in favour of the Arab struggle, as happened in certain episodes of the October War and its aftermath.

It has become evident that America's involvement in an area of conflict as a party hostile to the will of the peoples through the conventional imperialist forms will turn this will towards an anti-American stand, regardless of the strong grip of America's local allies, the reactionary regimes.

Excerpt from an interview given by Saddam Hussein to Egyptian journalist Sakina al-Sadat on 19 January 1977

With all this I want to explain to you the manner of our thinking. When the Americans consider this area sensitive in their strategic calculations, they do not do so because of its oil resources, as some people think, or because of their need for oil, or on account of the sensitive situation of the area from the strategic and military angle only, but also because of a major factor which may have technical and political priority at this stage over other considerations. Whoever enjoys effective influence in the Middle East will be able to influence Europe and Japan. This is the principal factor which may have priority over the other two considerations which I mentioned before. Where does the power of the United States lie? What is the principal element in its strength outside the territory of the United States? It lies in the alliance of Europe and Japan with the United States. But when the sources of oil become independent, Japan will be able to deal with the Arabs directly, without any need to have American protection for its interests, as the United States puts it to the Japanese. As Japan imports all the materials required for its industry, its lines of communication and the maintenance of its industries depend on the United States for protection because Japan has no army capable of discharging the function, due to the consequences of the Second World War. The United States also fully realizes that the independence of Arab oil and the direct dealing of Europe and Japan with the Arabs to safeguard their oil needs will weaken its grip on Europe and Japan.

The National Declaration of 8 February 1980

In order to keep the Arab Homeland free from foreign spheres of influence, to emphasize the independence of the people and the land of the Arab Nation, to put its material and human potentialities in the service of its independence and progress, the National Declaration was announced by President-Leader Saddam Hussein on February 8th, 1980, the anniversary of the February 8th, 1963 Revolution. The Declaration embodies those objectives, forms a working guide and a precise practical and revolutionary programme to save the Arab Nation from Zionist and imperialistic stratagems, and from the attempts of major powers, who are still trying feverishly to extend control over the Arab Homeland, and the Arabian Gulf in particular, owing to the strategic, economic,

political and oil advantages in the area. Those attempts aim at the consecration of division, backwardness and weakness, supporting all that by the establishment of foreign military bases in this vital part of the world.

The Arab masses have received the National Declaration with great excitement and support. Between March 25th and 28th, 1980, a popular conference was held in Baghdad to discuss the Declaration, where it was unanimously adopted. A number of the Arab countries, which realize the struggle of major powers for their own interests, gave their support to this National Declaration.

In the Name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

DECLARATION

In view of the present international situation and its potential future developments, and in the light of the serious possibilities threatening the Arab sovereignty and national security, on the one hand, and world peace and security on the other; and in response to the demands of national responsibility to the Arab nation's land, culture and heritage; and in accordance with the principles of the non-Aligned Movement, Iraq feels called upon to take the initiative by issuing the following declaration, to be taken, first as a charter regulating the national relations among the Arab countries, and secondly as a pledge by the Arab nation to the neighboring states which declare their respect and commitment to this charter.

The declaration is based on the following principles:

ONE. The rejection of the presence in the Arab homeland of any foreign armies and military forces, or any foreign forces and military bases, or any facilities in any form, or under any pretext or cover, or for any reason whatsoever. Any Arab regime that fails to abide by this principle should be isolated and boycotted politically and economically, and its policies should be resisted by all means available.

TWO. Prohibiting the use of armed forces by any Arab state against any other Arab state. All disputes that may arise among Arab states should be settled by peaceful means, and in accordance with the principles of joint national action and the supreme Arab interests.

THREE. The principle mentioned in Article applies to the relations of the Arab nation and countries with the neighboring nations and states. No armed forces should be used to resolve disputes with these states except in defending sovereignty in self-defense, and in cases where the security and fundamental interests of the Arab countries are threatened.

FOUR. Solidarity of all Arab countries in the face of any foreign aggression or violation committed by any foreign power against the territorial integrity and sovereignty of any Arab country. In the event of any foreign power declaring war on any Arab country, all Arab countries should jointly resist and thwart that aggression or violation by all means available, including military action and total political and economic embargo, and in all other fields deemed necessary and in the national interest.

FIVE. Confirming the commitment of all Arab countries to the international laws and conventions regarding the use of waterways, air and territory by any state that is not at war with any Arab country.

SIX. Arab countries should keep away from the arenas of international conflicts and wars, and should present complete neutrality and non-alignment towards any party in conflict or war, except when such party violates the Arab territory, sovereignty or rights of Arab countries guaranteed by international laws and conventions. Arab countries should refrain from military participation--wholly or partially--in wars and military disputes, inside or outside the area, on behalf of a foreign state or party.

SEVEN. Commitment of the Arab countries to establish advanced and constructive inter-Arab economic relations, to provide and solidify the common ground for advanced Arab economic structure and Arab unity. Arab countries should avoid any act that may harm these relations or block their continuity and development, regardless of their different systems of government, or the marginal differences that may arise among them, so long as the parties concerned remain committed to the principles of this Declaration.

Arab countries should abide by the principle of national economic integration. Arab countries economically competent should offer all kinds of economic aid to other Arab countries to safeguard against dependence on foreign powers, in a manner infringing these countries' independence and national will.

EIGHT. In presenting the principles of this Declaration, Iraq confirms its readiness to abide by it with respect to every Arab country, and every party committed to it. Iraq is also ready to discuss this Declaration with the Arab brethren, and listen to their comments thereon, to enhance the effectiveness of its principles and deepen its implications.

Iraq also confirms that this Declaration is no substitute for the Arab League Charter or the Treaty of Joint Defense and Economic Co-operation concluded by the Arab League members. Rather, Iraq deems it a reinforcement of the charter and Treaty, and a development thereupon, in line with the developing international conditions, the dangers threatening the Arab nation and its consequent national responsibilities towards the present and future circumstances.

Great people of Iraq! Masses of the great Arab nation!

In presenting this declaration, Iraq is urged by its national responsibility which supersedes any subjective or regional interest. While we approach the Arab governments with this declaration, as the authority responsible for applying it and abiding by its principles, we deeply believe that these principles cannot be ascertained and become a charter for Arab relations except through the struggle and support of the Arab masses, because the Declaration ensures their basic interests and responds to their national aspirations in liberty and independence, and paves the way for the Arab Unity.

Saddam Hussein, Chair of R.C.C., President of the Republic of Iraq,

Speech by Saddam Hussein at the end of the Baghdad summit on 30 May 1990

I personally have learned many lessons from this conference, just as any other individual goes on learning the lessons of life until his last moment. Humanitarian lessons are the most important lessons of life. God willing, our future conferences will all be like this and previous conferences, although previous ones witnessed certain fraternal discomforts. Thank God, this conference has proceeded normally.

Still, I have one observation to make to this righteous meeting. You know, brothers, that since 1986 the most important resource in all of our economies--whether in Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Libya, Algeria, Kuwait, or the other oil-producing Arab countries, which now symbolize economic strength in Arab life--you know that the most important resource of these states is basically oil. Since 1980, when we were at war, we faced circumstances as difficult as the war itself because they affected our economy and basic resource--oil. There was confusion in the oil market. There was lack of adherence to OPEC decisions.

True, we are not in an OPEC conference, but I have already said that I am only making an observation so I will not pause too long. What I am going to say will benefit all of us. The cause of this confusion is the failure by some of our Arab brothers to abide by the OPEC decisions when they flooded the world market with more oil than it needed, thereby enabling clients to buy below the fixed price. Prices dropped to a level which sometimes fell to \$7 per barrel.

Regarding Iraq, which is not the biggest producer or the country with the largest share in OPEC, I was told that for every one dollar drop in the price of a barrel of oil, our loss amounted to \$1 billion annually. So we can see what a great loss the entire Arab nation suffered in its total annual oil production. Here is where we can find the answer to our direct questions: Is the Arab nation in a position to endure a loss of tens of billions as a result of an unjustified mistake by some technician or non-technician, especially as the oil market is, or let us say the clients are, at least, prepared to pay up to \$25 for the next two years, as we have learned or heard from the Westerners who are the main clients in the oil market?

Therefore, this enormous drain on our economy derives from a lack of vision or a failure by those directly concerned locally to view matters from a pan-Arab angle. Had matters been viewed from a pan-Arab angle and from the harm that would befall the entire Arab nation, I believe we would have hesitated for a long time before inflicting such great harm to the pan-Arab economy. With the same frankness, fraternity, and simplicity, we say that war is fought with soldiers and much harm is done by explosions, killing, and coup attempts--but it is also done by economic means.

Therefore, we would ask our brothers who do not mean to wage war--I am now speaking only as far as Iraqi sovereignty is concerned--I say to those who do not mean to wage war on Iraq: This is in fact a kind of war against Iraq. Were it possible, we would have endured. But I believe that all our brothers are fully aware of our situation. God willing, our situation will always be good. But I say that we have reached a point where we can no longer withstand pressure. I believe we will all benefit, as will the nation, if everyone adheres to the OPEC decisions on production or prices. Let us place our trust in God.

Excerpt from a speech by Saddam Hussein marking the Revolution's 22 Anniversary on 15 July 1990

... However, no sooner had the Baghdad summit ended and its resolutions become known, than the evil seeds grew shoots in an attempt in an attempt to overwhelm the shoots of the good seeds that have blossomed into flowers. In their recent campaign, the imperialist and Zionist forces have not used weapons to kill the sons of the nation, nor have they threatened to use their fleets and air bases in this region and elsewhere in the world, as is often done by the usurpers of the land and the violators of Arab dignity and sovereignty whom the Baghdad summit confronted. Rather they started to weaken and kill the capability that protects Arab dignity and sovereignty by tools and methods suited to them. They followed a method, which produces results that are more dangerous than those produced by the old direct methods. This new method, which has appeared within the ranks of the Arabs, seeks to cut off livelihood while the old method, which had already been contained, sought to cut off necks.

When livelihood is cut off, the roots dry up and the shoots and branches wilt and become timber due to the loss of the basic source of life. Imperialism and Zionism hope that they will succeed by this method after they have failed by traditional methods. They hope that they will succeed in stopping scientific and technological advancement in Iraq, both in the civilian and military spheres, and thus achieve the aim of their campaign, which they failed to achieve by the direct traditional method. They hope to achieve their aim by this new method and through the Arabs themselves, both individuals and even states, in this region. I mean by that, the new oil policy which certain rulers of the Gulf states have been pursuing intentionally for some time to reduce oil prices without any economic justification and against the wish of the majority of OPEC producers, and also against the interest of the Arab nation. For instance, a drop of one dollar in the price of a barrel of oil as a result of this policy leads to a drop of one billion dollars in Iraqi revenues annually.

Reducing the price of oil from the price that existed not very long ago--that is \$27 or \$28--to the current low price of oil has resulted in Iraq's losing \$14 billion dollar annually at a time when several billion dollars could complete much of what has been suspended or postponed in the life of the Iraqis, the militant people who fought in seas of blood in defense of their pride, freedom, sovereignty, and security; and in defense of the pride, freedom, sovereignty, and security of the Arab nation.

Regarding what is hidden behind this subversive policy and its objectives, we must note what is no longer a secret. The United States' need to import oil is increasing at high rates that correspond to its increasing demand, which may be much higher than we know. Middle East oil, and particularly Arab oil, is likely to meet its needs. Now that it has the chance, the United States is determined to become the only superpower, without competition, not only now or in the future, but as with all dreamers, for a time when it can transform the dream into a boundless reality for years. To achieve this, it is striving to guarantee the flow of oil to it at the cheapest prices. It also works to control oil and those who own it so it can later control the fate of its other consumers, particularly the European states and Japan, and perhaps the Soviet Union if it becomes an oil importer at a later time. For the United States to control the fate of oil producers, it must not allow them to develop their financial resources and wealth in a way that would enable them to operate naturally in the relationship between the owner/seller and buyer.

Because the Israeli hostility and expansion policy, and the requirements of the U.S. superpower in the region still exist, the United States wants an increasing strategic reserve to guarantee all those objectives, primarily, to control the instigation of wars, strife, and all that would put the wolf at the region's throat, and also when and how to impose stability for a time.

If purchased at a price lower than its true value, the oil reserve will not be as heavy a burden for the U.S. Treasury as it would be if purchased at its true value. The convergence of interests between U.S. speculators in the oil market, who want to buy oil when its price drops and store and offer it for sale when its price increases, and the policy of certain Arabs, who trade in oil and politics--some of whom are oil ministers and some of whom are at a higher level--constitutes the most important feature of this subversive policy.

If this policy is allowed to continue, it will mean that surplus Arab oil revenues in excess of Arab requirements will find their way to U.S. coffers. Not to mention that over time our money will lose its value and we will have tied ourselves to the political and financial objectives of the United States. Huge oil reserves in the United States would enable it, along with Israel and their temporary allies, to manipulate regional stability and security. The United States and Israel would then be out to start wars whenever they deem it necessary, without worrying about a potential halt to the flow of oil to American and other world markets. The United States would thus be in a position to dictate oil prices and even control their readjustment upward or downward to compromise the economies of Arab states and keep them from devising stable development and current spending programs.

Such a scenario is not without its negative economic and financial repercussions and, by extension, equally grave social and political implications. The Arabs would thus be in a constant maelstrom and state of instability. Hence, the policies pursued by certain Arab rulers are American-inspired and detrimental to the interests of the Arab nation. Such policies are far from patriotic and are at loggerheads with the interests of the Arab nation. Indeed, such policies are anti-Arab because, having stripped the Arab nation of its vital resources and allowed the covetous enemies to control them, these policies strike at pan-Arab security and interests.

Honorable Arabs, such policies are much too dangerous for us to condone; they have done us and the Arab nation considerable damage. For us to be content with condemning such viciousness is hardly the proper response. Since the Iraqis, who have been at the receiving end of this premeditated injustice, are sufficiently motivated to stand up for their rights, they will always be mindful of the Arab adage that one would be better off dead than having one's livelihood cut off. If words fail to afford us protection, then we will have no choice but to resort to effective action to put things right and ensure the restitution of our rights.

True patriotism and pan-Arabism will be judged according to the kind of oil policies we pursue and where we stand on the Arab-Zionist conflict and the struggle for the liberation of Palestine. Only by this yardstick can we separate the sheep from the goats. Only by this standard can we tell the dissemblers from the upright and the honest. Given enough alertness and sagacity, the children of the Arab nation, who have been most deeply wounded and harmed by charlatans, will not fail to discern the lurking dangers. There is nothing more compro-

missing than for the Arab nation and its future to remain silent once it has spotted the traps set for it. We will lead the way in exposing conspiracy and plotters and in working to drive out spinelessness from our midst, to help the weak overcome their weakness if they declare they are will to accept help in terms of oil or otherwise.

Brothers, we are forced to say this. And this pain breaks our hearts. This saddens us a great deal. We did not wish to speak of usurped rights when the usurpers are Arabs. We wished to focus in our speech, as has always been our habit, on the rights usurped exclusively by foreigners. However, the evildoers are the only ones held responsible before God and the nation for the consequences of their bad deeds, in which they have shown things we have never seen before. We wish they would show other things. They should have rewarded Iraq, which for their sake sacrificed the cream of its youth so their coffers would remain full of abundant and treasured wealth. Had it not been for Iraq, these coffers would have now been in other hands. But, instead, they have inflicted excessive harm on Iraq.

Instead of rewarding Iraq for its fraternal principles, they have misunderstood these sincere principles and have thrust their poisoned dagger into our back at a time when Iraq is facing external enemies and trying to defend the nation and avert any further stabs against the nation and Iraq.

O God, when patience becomes ineffective, bestow on us the patience which You deem appropriate and proper. O God, kill the seeds of evil within the hearts of those who have evil in their hearts so the Arabs may enjoy the seeds of good within their hearts. O God, be my witness that I have conveyed the message.

Greetings to the mujahid Palestinian people. Greetings to all honorable Arabs who reject what needs to be rejected and accept with pride, dignity, sovereignty, and justice what can be accepted. May mercy and glory be the lot of Iraqi and Arab martyrs. May God's peace, mercy, and blessings be upon you.

Letter to Arab League Secretary General Chedli Klibi from Tariq 'Aziz, Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Iraq, on 15 July 1990

Your Excellency Arab League Secretary General Chedli Klibi, brotherly greetings:

At the beginning of this letter we should recall the principles in which Iraq believes and which Iraq has applied with total honesty to its Arab relations. Iraq believes that the Arabs in all their countries are one nation. It also assumes that everyone should benefit from their wealth. If one is hurt or harmed, everyone will be affected. Iraq views the nation's wealth on this basis and uses its wealth in accordance with these principles.

Iraq also believes that, despite the harm done to the Arab nation during and after the Ottoman era and under Western colonialism--which resulted in various kinds of division, humiliation, and persecution as well as attempts to distort the pan-Arab personality, the pillars of Arab unity are still alive and strong. Despite its fragmentation into states, the Arab nation is one homeland and any inch of that homeland anywhere in this or that country should be primarily dealt with in light of pan-Arab considerations, especially pertaining to joint pan-Arab security. We also should avoid falling into the abyss of a narrow and selfish attitude in dealing with this or that country's interests and rights.

The Arab nation's higher interests and the higher strategic calculations of pan-Arab security should always be present. They also should be a major criteria for the Arab countries in dealing with these issues. In light of these honest and sincere pan-Arab principles, Iraq has dealt with Kuwait despite the past and present facts that are known about both Kuwait and Iraq. What prompted us to write this letter is that we are, regrettably, experiencing Kuwaiti behavior outside the framework of the pan-Arab concepts we have just mentioned. Moreover, this behavior conflicts with and threatens them. It also conflicts with the simplest basis of relations among the Arab countries.

Despite our brotherly and honest attitudes toward them in all issues and despite our eagerness to continue the brotherly dialogue with them at all times, Kuwaiti Government officials have encroached on Iraq and systematically, deliberately, and continuously harmed it. They also deliberately tried to weaken it after it emerged from the crushing eight-year war. All honest Arabs-leaders, intellectuals, and nationalists, including the leaders of the Arabian Gulf countries-had said that during this war Iraq was defending the sovereignty of the entire Arab nation, the Gulf countries, and Kuwait in particular.

The Kuwaiti Government has pursued this policy, which deliberately tries to weaken Iraq at a time when it is confronting a fierce imperialist-Zionist campaign as a result of its pan-Arab positions in defending the Arab right. This policy, regrettably, is prompted by selfish motives, shortsightedness, and goals that should be viewed as suspect and dangerous.

There are two issues in this regard. The first is the following:

It is well known that since the colonialist era, when the colonialists imposed divisions on the Arab nation, an issue has remained in abeyance between Iraq and Kuwait on the demarcation of borders. Contacts that were made during the sixties and seventies did not succeed in resolving this issue between the two sides until war broke out between Iraq and Iran. During the long years of war when the brave Iraqis were shedding their blood on the

front in defense of Arab territories, including Kuwait, and in defense of the Arab sovereignty and dignity, including that of Kuwait, the Kuwaiti Government exploited Iraq's engagement in war and its genuine Arab principles and noble approach to dealing with the brothers and pan-Arab issues, and implemented a plot to escalate the pace of the gradual, systematic advance toward Iraqi territory. The Kuwaiti Government set up military establishments, police posts, oil installations, and farms on Iraqi territory.

We remained silent about all of this and were satisfied with hints and gestures which we hoped would be sufficient in view of the concepts of brotherhood, which we believed everyone had at heart. However, these measures continued in a vicious manner and with a persistence that demonstrated deliberate scheming.

Following the al-Faw liberation and during the 1988 Algiers Arab summit, we informed the Kuwaiti side of our sincere desire to resolve this issue within the framework of brotherhood and supreme Arab interests. However, we found ourselves facing a situation which caused consternation. Despite the fact that logically Kuwaiti officials should be happy because of the kind Iraqi gesture and work for a speedy solution to this issue, we noticed that they are intentionally stalling talks and contacts and they are fabricating complications in addition to continuing their encroachments and their establishment of military and oil installations, police posts, and farms on Iraqi territory. We counseled patience as dictated by wisdom and self-restraint.

We were prepared to bear more had not issues taken a serious turn that was impossible to tolerate. This will be dealt with in the next issue, which is more dangerous in the present discourse. Iraq maintains complete records of this subject, explaining and supporting with documents and facts all the Kuwaiti Government's encroachments.

The second issue is the following:

For many months, precisely since Iraq began to call for regaining Arab rights in Palestine and to draw attention to the dangers of the U.S. presence in the Gulf, the Kuwaiti Government began to adopt an unjust policy aimed at harming the Arab nation, particularly Iraq. The Government of the United Arab Emirates participated with the Kuwaiti Government in this regard.

The Governments of Kuwait and the UAE implemented an intentional scheme to glut the oil market with a quantity of oil that exceeded their quotas as fixed by OPEC under flimsy justifications which were devoid of logic, justice, or fairness and with pretexts that none of the sisterly producing states supported. This intentional policy led to a serious drop in oil prices. Following the drop from the high rates that were reached years ago, i.e., \$34, \$29, and \$28 per barrel, the conduct of the Kuwaiti and UAE Governments led to a drop beyond the minimum price on which an agreement was reached in OPEC recently, which is \$18 per barrel, with the result that the price plummeted to between \$11 and \$13 per barrel. In a simple mathematical calculation, we can estimate the losses that the Arab oil producing states have incurred:

1. The production average of the Arab states is 14 million barrels per day. The drop in oil prices between 1981 and 1990 led to a loss of \$500 billion by the Arab states, of which Iraq sustained \$89 billion. Had the Arabs not lost this tremendous amount of money and had we allotted half of it for national development and for assisting poor Arab states, we would have seen great advances in pan-Arab development, made the poor Arabs happy, and the Arab nation would have been more prosperous than it is now. If we adopt the 1987 minimum price for oil as fixed by OPEC, i.e., \$18 per barrel, we find that the Arab states have lost about \$25 billion as a result of the drop in oil prices since 1987.

2. A drop of one dollar in the price of a barrel of oil leads to a drop of one billion dollars in Iraqi revenues annually. It is known that the oil price this year dropped several dollars from the \$18 price as a result of the policy of the Kuwaiti and UAE Governments. This means that Iraq will lose several billion in revenue this year at a time when it is suffering from a financial crisis as a result of the costs of the legitimate defense of its territories, security, and sanctities and the Arabs' territories, security, and sanctities during the eight-year long war. These grave losses, as a result of the deterioration of oil prices, did not only affect the Arab oil-producing states but the other fraternal states that used to receive aid from their fraternal Arab oil-producing states. Thus the aid funds decreased and, in some cases, stopped. The institutions of joint Arab action also deteriorated and suffered crises. These institutions are now in a very difficult situation as a result of this policy, which was also used as a pretext to decrease or stop aid to joint Arab action institutions.

In addition to these premeditated abuses, the Kuwaiti Government added another abuse aimed at harming Iraq in particular. Since 1980 Kuwait has set up oil installations in the southern section of the Iraqi al-Rumaylah oil field and extracted oil from it. In light of this, it becomes clear that part of the surplus oil Kuwait was dumping on the world oil market was stolen from the Iraqi al-Rumaylah oil field. Thus it has deliberately harmed Iraq twice; once by weakening its economy when it is in a dire need of funds and again by stealing its wealth. Based on prices between 1980 and 1990, the oil stolen by the Kuwaiti Government from the al-Rumaylah oil field in this manner that conflicts with fraternal relations amounts to \$24 billion. We put on record before the Arab League and all the Arab states that Iraq has every right to retrieve the funds stolen from it and to ask those concerned to rectify the harm done to it.

Several times in the past we have explained the dangers posed by the Kuwait and UAE Governments'

policy to our brothers in the Arab oil-producing states, including Kuwait and the UAE. We complained and we warned. At the Baghdad summit, President Saddam Hussein spoke frankly and in a brotherly way about this issue with the Arab kings, presidents, and amirs in the presence of those concerned. Attached to this letter is the text of the president's speech on this issue at the Baghdad summit.

We believed, especially following the positive fraternal atmosphere that permeated the Baghdad summit, that the Kuwaiti and UAE Governments would abandon this policy. However, the painful fact is that, despite all efforts and contacts with fraternal states to play a positive role in making the Kuwaiti and UAE Governments desist from this course and President Saddam Hussein's speech at the Baghdad summit, these two governments have deliberately continued this policy. In fact, some of these governments' officials made impudent statements when we divulged these facts and complained about them. In light of this, there is no room left for ruling out the deduction that what the Kuwaiti and UAE Governments did in this regard was a premeditated policy that seeks to achieve hidden objectives. Although we realize that this policy, which has led to the collapse of oil prices, will eventually harm the economies of these two countries themselves, we have no choice but to deduce that he who deliberately, directly, and openly adopts this policy, or he who supports or instigates it, is implementing part of the imperialist-Zionist plan against Iraq and the Arab nation, especially at this particular time when serious Israeli-imperialist dangers are threatening the Arab homeland in general and Iraq in particular.

How can we confront this serious threat and preserve the balance of power, which Iraq has achieved at a very dear price, given the losses it suffered during the war as a result of the collapse of its basic revenue and the loss in revenue of the Arab oil-exporting countries, including Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Oman, Yemen, Egypt, Syria, Algeria, and Libya? This is in addition to the fact that this suspect policy will weaken these Arab countries' ability to confront their serious economic and social problems, which can have dire consequences. To what fate do the Kuwaiti and UAE Governments want to draw the Arab nation under these difficult, critical, and dangerous circumstances, and whose policies and goals do they want to satisfy?

After we explained these matters to all our brothers, after we directly asked these two governments to refrain from this unjust and destructive policy, after we explained to them before, during, and after the Baghdad summit the harm to which we were being exposed, and after we sent envoys and wrote messages, we condemn the Kuwaiti and UAE Governments' direct aggression against Iraq and the Arab nation. Regarding the Kuwaiti Government, we can say that its aggression against Iraq is a twofold one. On the one hand, it has committed aggression against Iraq and its rights by encroaching on our territories and oil-fields and by stealing our national wealth. Such behavior amounts to a military aggression. On the other hand, the Kuwaiti Government wants to destroy the Iraqi economy at a time when it is being exposed to fierce imperialist-Zionist threats. It is an aggression that is not less effective than military aggression.

While we are presenting these painful facts to our Arab brothers, we hope that our brothers will raise their voices high to put an end to this deliberate and premeditated aggression and will advise the deviates to return to proper behavior which takes into consideration the common pan-Arab interest and the requirements of common pan-Arab security.

3. Regarding the higher pan-Arab interests and the link between Arab wealth and the fate of the Arab nation, we propose the following: If all the Arab oil-producing and non-oil-producing countries had realized strong political solidarity, agreed to raise the oil price to over \$25, and then established a fund for Arab aid and development as agreed to during the Amman summit on the condition that this fund be financed with one dollar for every oil barrel sold by the Arab oil-producing countries for more than \$25, the amount of money in the fund would have been \$5 billion per year. At the same time, great increases in the revenues of the oil-exporting countries would have been realized because collective Arab solidarity which can achieve this fair price will increase their present revenues and will protect them from aggressive attempts to weaken the Arab power through decreasing their oil revenues. We can imagine how such a fixed amount of money will reinforce pan-Arab security and will achieve development for all the Arab countries and enable them to confront the suffocating economic difficulty from which most of our countries are suffering. Iraq is presenting the proposal for serious study. The forthcoming Arab summit conference may provide an opportunity to discuss and approve this proposal.

4. Regarding these painful facts, we believe it is necessary to clarify the vague notion held by some Arab brothers about the aid extended by Kuwait and the UAE during the war.

A. Honest Arabs throughout the Arab homeland have agreed that the war which Iraq was obliged to wage was not only intended to defend its sovereignty but also to defend the eastern flank of the Arab homeland, especially the Arabian Gulf region. This was confirmed by the Gulf leaders themselves in the strongest words. Therefore, this was a pan-Arab battle in which Iraq assumed the responsibility of defending pan-Arab security as well as security in the Gulf region in particular.

B. During the war Iraq was offered various kinds of assistance from its brothers in some Gulf states. The bulk of this assistance was extended as interest-free loans. Iraq received such assistance in the first stages of the war and has not received any more since 1982. At the time Iraq did not discuss the arrangements pertaining to this assistance with its brothers because it hoped the war would not be long and that following the war it would regain

its economic ability in full. However, the war dragged on and its cost reached very exorbitant levels. The value of the military hardware for which Iraq paid hard currency and which was used in the war amounted to \$102 billion in addition to other military and civilian expenses, which reached tremendous levels in a grinding war that lasted for eight years along a 1,200-km front.

And despite the fact that all the assistance which Iraq obtained from its brothers constituted only a small portion of the great cost borne by the Iraqi economy and people, who offered rivers of blood in defense of pan-Arab sovereignty and dignity, Iraq's leadership expressed its deep gratitude for all the brothers who offered assistance. President Saddam Hussein openly voiced this sentiment during visits by a number of brother Gulf leaders to Iraq.

However, the bitter truth that every Arab should know is that the basic part of the assistance we have mentioned is still recorded as debts, including what Kuwait and the UAE offered. More than a year ago we approached those concerned in a brotherly manner to cancel these debts but they evaded the issue. The quantities of oil which Kuwait sold for Iraq from the al-Khafji area when the Iraqi oil pipeline that passes through Syria was closed were also recorded as Iraqi debts, despite the fact that these quantities were sold outside Kuwait's OPEC quota.

In order to reveal the complete picture about this issue, we must explain an important phase of the events in the oil market during the war. Before the war Iraq was a major oil-producing state, pumping more than 3.6 million barrels per day. When the war began Iraqi oil production completely stopped for several months. It then began exploring a small amount through Turkey and then through Syria until the oil pipeline closed in 1982. Iraq's export of oil from the south stopped from September 1980 until the pipeline that passes through Saudi Arabia became operational in September 1985. Thus because of the war Iraq lost a tremendous amount of money amounting to \$106 billion.

From a practical viewpoint these amounts were transferred to the coffers of the other oil-producing countries in the region, whose production increased to meet the shortage in Iraqi exports over a period of eight years. A simple calculation will show that the UAE and Kuwaiti loans to Iraq were not entirely from their treasuries but from the increases in their oil revenues as a result of the drop in Iraqi oil exports over the war years.

We wonder, is it possible to consider the assistance given to Iraq a debt when Iraq shouldered the responsibility of defending pan-Arab security, Arab sovereignty and dignity, and the Gulf states' wealth, which would have been lost to others had Iraq lost the war? The United States offered immense amounts of money from the American taxpayers as assistance to the USSR and the U.S. Western allies, who are not part of one nation as the Arabs are, during World War II. Following the war the United States spent great amounts of money within the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe. It was acting within a comprehensive strategic concept pertaining to its security and the international group to which it belongs and which joined in the war against the common enemy.

How can these amounts be regarded as Iraqi debts to its Arab brothers when Iraq made sacrifices that are many times more than these debts in terms of Iraqi resources during the grinding war and offered rivers of bloods of its youth in defense of the nation's soil, dignity, honor, and wealth? Taking the U.S. precedent into consideration, does not the logic of regional security make it incumbent on these states not only to cancel these debts but also to organize an Arab plan similar to the Marshall Plan to compensate Iraq for some of the losses during the war? This would have been the pan-Arab logic had there been a genuine sense of Arabism and pan-Arab affiliation and had there been an earnest attitude toward pan-Arab security.

Instead of adhering to such a responsible pan-Arab approach, we find that two of the Gulf states, whose wealth was preserved by Iraq through the blood of its men and whose revenues increased because of the drop in Iraq's oil production, are now trying to destroy the Iraqi economy and reduce its revenues. One of them, which is the Kuwaiti Government, is trespassing on Iraqi territory and stealing the wealth of those who protected Kuwait's territory, honor, and wealth.

We present these painful facts to the conscience of every noble Arab, led by the fraternal Kuwaiti people, so they can appreciate the pain, harm, and loss that have been afflicting us.

Mr. Secretary General, please distribute this letter among the Arab states, together with my greetings and good wishes.

Tariq 'Aziz,
Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of the Republic of Iraq on 15 July 1990

Excerpts from the Minutes of the Audience given by His Excellency President Saddam Hussein to April Glaspie, US Ambassador to Iraq, on 25 July 1990

[The President] When planned and deliberate policy forces the price of oil down without good commercial means, then that means another war against Iraq. . . .

Military war kills people, but economic war kills their humanity by depriving them of their chance to have a good standard of living. As you know, we gave rivers of blood in a war that lasted eight years, but we did not lose our humanity. Iraqis have a right to live proudly. We do not accept that anyone could injure Iraqi pride or the Iraqi right to have a high standard of living. [The Kuwaiti regime has been] at the forefront of that policy. . . .

We want others to know that our patience is running out, regarding their actions [which deny] even the milk our children drink, and the pensions of the widow who lost her husband during the war. . . . We are not aggressors, but we do not accept aggression either. . . .

You can come to Iraq with aircraft and missiles, but do not push us to the point we cease to care. And when we feel that you want to injure our pride and take away the Iraqi's chance of a high standard of living, then we will cease to care and death will be the choice for us. Then we would not care if you fired 100 missiles for each missile we fired because without pride life would have no value. . . .

[Ambassador Glaspie] Thank you Mr. President. It gives me, as a diplomat, great pleasure to meet you, Mr. President, and to have a direct discussion with you. I clearly understand the message you have given me. We studied history at school and were taught to say "freedom or death." I believe that you know well that we, as a nation, have our own experience with colonialism. Mr. President, you have made many points throughout this meeting. I cannot respond to them all in my government's behalf. Yet, allow me to comment on two points. You spoke of friendship, and I believe that our President has stressed in his letter to you including the letter he sent on the occasion of your National Day. . . .

[The President] He was generous, and we appreciate and respect his expressions.

[Ambassador Glaspie] As you know, he instructed the US Administration to absolutely and constantly reject the proposed economic sanctions [referring to the trade sanctions being suggested by Congress]. . . .

I have direct instructions from the president himself to expand and enhance relations with Iraq.

[The President] But how can we achieve that? We too have the same desire, but the way things are going is not compatible with this desire!

[Ambassador Glaspie] I think the more we discuss these matters the less will become the possibility you mentioned. . . .

Mr. President, I not only wish to say that President Bush seeks better and deeper relations with Iraq, but also wants to see a historical contribution made by Iraq to peace and prosperity in the Middle East. . . .

I think I understand what you say. I have lived here for four years. I admire your extraordinary efforts to rebuild your country. I know you need funds. We understand that, and are of the opinion that you should have the opportunity to rebuild your country. But what we hold no opinion about are inter-Arab disputes, such as your border disagreement with Kuwait. I was in the American embassy in Kuwait during the late sixties. The instructions we had at that time were that we should have nothing to do with this issue and that the issue was not connected with US concerns. James Baker has directed our official spokesman to emphasize this instruction.

Excerpt from the "Victory Day Message Commemorating 8 August 1988" by Saddam Hussein on 7 August 1990

The malicious Westerners, while partitioning the Arab homeland, intentionally multiplied the number of countries with the result that the Arab nation could not achieve the integration needed to realize its full capability. In this way, they also fragmented capabilities. While fragmenting the Arab homeland, they intentionally distanced the majority of the population density and area of cultural depth from riches and their sources, something new to the life of Arabs. This became one of the most dangerous results of partition and a fatal wedge in Arab relations.

The wealth centered in one place, in the hands of a minority lacking in cultural depth or, or accurately, having no record of cultural depth. On the other hand, cultural depth and population density centered in a place remote from the sources of the new wealth, as I said. This malicious act resulted in the minority becoming so corrupt that it was cut off from its nation. It stopped mentioning this nation, except in lip service and on some ceremonial occasions. The wealth in the hands of this minority did not come as a result of legitimate hard work. The overwhelming majority of the nations, which was living away from the sources of wealth and enduring a major part of its negative impact on its life in the social, psychological, cultural, military, and political spheres, suffered a weakness that, if not overcome, could not allow this majority to play a vital and effective role in the life of the nation.

The authority of the honorable national and pan-Arab majority and its leading influence on the Arab life was absent and was replaced by the authority of the corrupt minority, which is connected with the foreigner. As a result, the nation was hit right between the eyes, and the damage it suffered was no less in its consequences than direct foreign rule. Indeed, at some stages of the nation's life, direct foreign rule awakened--through reaction--the national and pan-Arab awareness and crystallized the factors of spiritual upsurge in which the nation invoked its genuine values from the depths of its culture.

Initiatives for the Maintenance of Peace in the Middle East offered by Saddam Hussein on 12 August 1990

In the name of God the merciful, the compassionate,

So as to contribute to creating an atmosphere of real peace in the region; and in order to facilitate the achievement of stability in the area; and to expose the lies of America and its ugly ally, Israel, as well as America's minor allies and their crimes against the nation; and to assert what is right from a position of strength with faith in God and the people, we have decided to propose the following initiative:

The United States tried to conceal its acts against humanity and the peoples of the region behind the pretext that the decision to impose an economic embargo on Iraq was a protest against the assistance which Iraq gave the people of Kuwait who saved themselves from the rule of the Sabah family. It then lost its senses when the people of Kuwait and Iraq rejoined what British colonialism divided into Iraq and Kuwait. Kuwait had stayed a part of Iraq until World War I. Iraq refuses to accept the crime perpetuated by colonialism.

Now America has proceeded to mobilize its military fleets and aircraft squadrons, and has begun to beat the drums of war against Iraq on the pretext of confronting Iraqi threats against Saudi Arabia.

Because war, if ignited by a spark, would burn many people and inflict great destruction on whoever may lie in its path; and in order to state facts as they are to world public opinion in general and Western public opinion in particular, and to expose the American lie that it supports the causes and rights of the people; and that it only seeks to maintain the security and interests of the West; I propose that all issues of occupation in the region, and that which has been misrepresented as occupation, be solved in accordance with the same standard, principles, and premises laid down by the UN Security Council, as follows:

First, to make ready withdrawal arrangements according to the same principles for the immediate unconditional withdrawal of Israel from the occupied Arab territories in Palestine, Syria, and Lebanon, and for the Syrian withdrawal from Lebanon, and for the withdrawal of troops on the Iraq-Iran front, and to make arrangements for the status of Kuwait. All military units, including all political arrangements relating to them, will withdraw according to a timetable applied to all cases according to the same standard, principle, and premise, taking into consideration Iraq's historical rights to its territory and the will of the people of Kuwait. The withdrawals should start with the oldest cases of occupation or so-called "occupation." UN resolutions should be implemented in chronological order beginning with the oldest. The same measures adopted by the Security Council against Iraq should be implemented against anyone who refuses to cooperate with this arrangement.

Second, in order to present the true facts to world public opinion so that it can judge objectively apart from U.S. wishes and pressure, we propose the immediate withdrawal from Saudi Arabia all U.S. Forces and other forces that are cooperating with it in its plot, and these be replaced by Arab forces whose size, composition, duties, and deployment will be defined by the Security Council, assisted by the United Nations Secretary-General. The National composition of the Arab forces will be decided by agreement between Iraq and Saudi Arabia, on condition that they should not include troops sent by the government of Egypt which the United States uses in carrying out its plot against the Arab nation.

Third, all decisions related to the embargo and siege against Iraq will be immediately frozen. Matters should return to normal in the economic, political, and scientific dealings between Iraq and other countries, except where the conditions stated above stipulate otherwise.

However, if the United States and its minor allies and agents refuse to respond to our initiative, then we, the great people of Iraq, and the good sons of the Arab nation, will resist its evil intentions and aggressive schemes. We will triumph, with God's help, and the evildoers will regret their deeds, when they retreat from this area, damned, defeated, and shamed.

God is great. Cursed are the treacherous.

Open Letter to U.S. President George Bush from Saddam Hussein, dated 16 August, 1990

In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate:

An open letter to the President of the United States.

I have heard your feverish utterances and remarks before the U.S. Defense Department staff in which you expressed your determination to continue the policy of harming Iraq and occupying and insulting the holy places and land of the Arabs and Muslims in Hejaz and Najd [Saudi Arabia]. Frankly speaking, Mr. President, as I was reading your remarks, which clearly show an underestimation of and disregard for the Arab mentality and popular and official sentiments, your shallow thinking came into sharp focus, when I had thought you were more far-sighted. Also, my faith has been strengthened in the right path chosen by the people of Iraq, and down which I am leading them and through which I am serving them. My conviction of the soundness of every jealous Arab and Muslim choosing the route of jihad against invading forces has been reinforced.

President of the superpower: Along with your little agents, you have sought to stigmatize Saddam Hussein with the epithet of liar, having failed to tarnish him otherwise--you, who have access to fat files about others, from them--foremost of whom are your supporters in the region. You and your agents and your business partners in the region have been saying that Saddam Hussein promised Husni Mubarak that he would not do such-and-such a thing and yet went ahead and did it. This is despite the fact that you know that your greatest dream is for Saddam Hussein to lie, since the one who lies will lose the power to influence things and will relent in his determination, having lost the staples of faith, since what you hate most in terms of plotters in the United States and in terms of your little isolated agents in the region is the truthfulness of men. And the man you hate most is Saddam Hussein, inasmuch as his faithfulness toward principle, his honesty with himself and his people and nation make him the servant and leader of the people and nation and not the servant of the foreigner, while you look at liars in the region as true friends, and you know who the ultimate liars in the region are.

President of the United States: You have chosen to be a liar so that you may be in harmony with the band you have chosen and regard as representatives of the Arab nation. In your statements, you have lied to the people and public opinion, because you accused Saddam Hussein of being a liar, on the strength of the tale of Husni Mubarak in which he alleges that Saddam Hussein had promised not to use military force and yet he did. This tale has been disproved by evidence witnessed by at least eight Iraqi and Egyptian officials who are still alive and can bear witness.

I did not promise Husni Mubarak anything, except that I would not use force until after the Jeddah meeting had convened. This was explained in detail by an official Iraqi spokesman on 10 August 1990. I suppose that you must have taken cognizance of this statement. As you must be well aware, I used force only after the failure and end of the Jeddah meeting.

Besides, you lied to your people when you said that the majority of the Arabs support your measures to occupy the Gulf, Arab lands, and the Islamic holy lands of Hejaz and Najd [Saudi Arabia]. The Arabs, O President of the United States, are not the rulers who serve you, obey your orders, and share with you the plundering of the nation's wealth. The Arabs are the people. They are the sons of the nation--the poor, the honorable, and the sincerest patriots. They are the patriotic leaders and rulers who clearly expressed their opinion of your policy and the policy of your agents in their statements, in their rejection of your conspiracy that you termed the Cairo summit, and in the mass demonstrations and protests that will turn into a flood and sweep away the thrones of those who fail to resist your schemes, which humiliate the Arab nation and the Muslims' holy sites--the schemes in which you made clear how much you hate the Arabs and how much you despise their will as well as the will of Muslims.

The West, and even the U.S. public, will be on the side of right. When the fight escalates and the tensions worsen, your distorted image, as well as the distorted images of your allies, will be exposed to all well-meaning parties in the world. The Americans will then tell you: We united America with blood. Why are you working against the unity of the Iraqi people, who were divided by colonial powers? And why are you making yourself a hostage to the whims of the backward and the exploiters? They will ask you: Where are our legitimate interests that are threatened by Iraq? When the American people realize that legitimate interests are more than welcomed by Iraq, their wrath against you will increase, and then you will fall off your seat after the defeat of your brute force, which you deluded yourself into believing would terrorize the Arab nation. This is the great nation chosen by God to be the nation of prophets and messengers and the nation of heavenly books.

You, U.S. President, lied to your people when you told them that you were massing troops to protect American interests in Saudi Arabia. Now, you are telling them that they are there to force Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. You have not asked yourself: Is it permissible for Iraq to ask you to withdraw your troops from the southern United States? And would you respond favorably if we were to request you to do this? We are on our land. The Kuwaitis and Iraqis have been Iraqis since the beginning of time. Since time immemorial, Iraqi borders

extended from Zakho in the north to the city of al-Nida' [al-Ahmadi] and the city of Kuwait on the sea coast in the south.

With their irreversible manifestation of willpower, the Iraqis have become one people; just as they have always been throughout history. The people were divided by colonial powers at a certain phase. They were destined to live, during a short period of time, within the confines of the fences created by colonial powers. However, this has become a thing of the past. Besides, there is no chance for the backward oil amirs who distorted the Arab image to Westerners, including Americans, to return to the throne which disgraced the Arabs by its characteristics and standards and by the behavior of its rulers and those of their ilk among your allies.

You must be truthful to your people, O elected President of the United States, and tell them that you have miscalculated and that you have been hasty in your decision, thanks to those who involved you in this decision. You must say this to us, too, and ask us to help you so as to save face through measures and arrangements that do not change the essence of things as they have become, as regards the unity of Iraq--the land and the people. Moreover, you must also be truthful to your people and say that Arab public opinion--in fact, Islamic as well--are against your presence on the land of messages from heaven and the land of prophets, and against your aggression in the holy places and on Iraq, and that the Arab and Islamic public opinion will fight your schemes and will sacrifice blessed life in defense of faith, the values of the Islamic teachings, the holy places, and the honor of nationalism. You will be defeated, because falsehood cannot triumph after right has found its claimants, and the people have found their genuine reflection in right, justice, and fairness.

Moreover, are you not sad--being the President of the state which brags about being democratic--that your allies are those Arabs who are backward, thieves, and liars, while the enlightened, struggling, and mujahidin Arabs and the vanguard of the nation stand on the opposite side. However, we will continue to pray to God that the two sides will not collide, for then thousands of Americans wrapped up in sad coffins will reach you after you have sent them into a dark tunnel.

O Arabs, the doors of Heaven have been laid open to you, and you can smell its pure aroma; the opportunity for an honorable living has been made available to you.

O Muslims, your faithful role has come, and the door of jihad has been laid open--the door which angered the shameless fraud Bush--so, proceed toward it.

God is great. Accursed be the lowly. God is great. Accursed be the infidels and aggressors. Might for the Arabs and the Muslims and all honorable people who stand for right in the world.

Saddam Hussein, 16 August 1990.

Open letter to the families of foreigners in Iraq from Saddam Hussein, dated 19 August 1990

Ladies and gentlemen, dear children:

I know that you are pained because your relatives are not allowed to leave Iraq. I am just as pained as you are. I am fully convinced that the speaker and members of the Iraqi National Assembly are also pained just as are all the Iraqis and Arabs. This is because I know that the Iraqi National Assembly members are believers in God and in human rights, having fought many years to reach their present status for which they thank God. They know as well as I that their country taught humanity the first letter and thus taught them how to write and that their country taught the human race the first law to be developed on earth--the code of Hammurabi which set out human rights and obligations 4,500 years ago. They, therefore, know that there is no value to happiness in their country if the entire human race does not understand that any restriction of the freedom of any human being curtails the liberty of humankind in one of its aspects. They know that they care for human beings regardless of their nationality, color, or race, since they love God and God does not differentiate among his servants except on the basis of the extent of their faith and its requirements.

Accordingly, the National Assembly members are just as pained as you are and all of us are sorry for what happened, which was not of our own making, but was the outcome of the will of certain people who acted arbitrarily and deviated from the will and teachings of God. The parties basically directly responsible for this are the U.S. Administration and the British Government. How so? You know, ladies and gentlemen, that Iraq emerged from a war with Iran that lasted eight years and you know that this eight-year war was fought between two oil producers and in the environment of the Gulf oil and that in this war it happened that the Iraqi armies crossed into Iran and that the Iranian armies crossed into Iraq. Why did the United States, Britain, and others not interfere to end it, and why did they not threaten those who did not abide by the resolutions issued by the Security Council at that time?

They did not do that because they had contributed to its eruption and because they and their backward allies like the Croesus of Kuwait and his supporters had wanted it to continue and not to stop until God wanted it to stop. When it stopped, they gave their agents in the region, foremost the Croesus of Kuwait and his clique, the means of power to fight against the Iraqi people in their livelihood and to deprive us, through economic war

and aggression against our oil fields, of our simplest rights, although we are the people of a glorious civilization, until they had reduced the value of the Iraqi dinar to one-twentieth of the Kuwaiti dinar; that is, 54 fils of a Kuwaiti dinar. The value of the Iraqi dinar had been higher than the value of the Kuwaiti dinar in 1980, and now it has become difficult for us to provide milk for our children, although our country, the country of the two rivers, is a country of wealth and riches.

Gentlemen, you may not know that this country [Kuwait], whose rulers have been concocting plots, was part of Iraq until 1913 and that Iraq did not recognize it [as a separate country] even up to the 1960s when the Iraqi Prime Minister issued a proclamation in 1961 annexing Kuwait to Iraq, returning it once again into a district linked to Basrah and appointing its shaikh as governor as had been the case until World War I broke out. The Consultative Council in Kuwait decided twice in the thirties to unite with Iraq, a decision that was abrogated by the ruling family at that time; and that Iraqi Prime Minister Nuri al-Sa'id proposed unity with Kuwait to the Baghdad Pact in 1958 in the presence of the U.S. representative.

Why do the U.S. President and the British Prime Minister want to starve the Iraqi people to death? Cursed be what they are doing. What have the Iraqi people done other than unifying themselves and the families that were divided by circumstances in Iraq and Kuwait, defending themselves and helping to topple the backward Kuwaiti shaikh, whose only concern was collecting money and women? Why are they imposing a siege on Iraq to kill the babies and elderly as well as those who cannot get food and medicine, never mind that what the U.S. and British administrations want may not be achieved? Why are they massing naval fleets, squadrons of aircraft, and ground forces with which they want to attack Iraq? They said they had come here, and thus insulted the land of the Arabs and the sanctities of the Muslims by occupying the land of Hejaz and Najd [Saudi Arabia] in order to defend Saudi Arabia against the Iraqi danger. They are lying because they know that Iraq does not commit aggression, but retaliates when it is attacked. Those who have no plans to strike Iraq can rest assured.

Ladies and gentlemen, O beloved children of God, O dear and beloved children in Europe and the United States. As it is clear to you, our homeland is being threatened by the United States and Britain and those frustrated and humiliated ones involved with them. Our people are being threatened with great harm. If the accursed ones mount an aggression, many heads of rulers will fall from their shoulders and tens of thousands of women, men, and children will perish on both sides. The National Assembly in our country knows this, and in accordance with its constitutional and humanitarian duties, it is searching for a way to prevent the disaster.

Among other things, it has reached the conclusion, together with other officials, that preventing the foreigners from departing Iraq--particularly those whose governments have a hostile position and are taking part in the preparations for aggression and the economic embargo against Iraq--will constitute a means to open a deep dialogue with the peoples of those countries and those who represent them and with the administrations of those countries, to find a peaceful solution and avert the imminent catastrophe against the region and maybe the whole world that war would entail if it broke out.

At any rate, their presence with the Iraqi families working near the vital targets may prevent military aggression.

Nevertheless, we, the National Assembly in Iraq and the entire people of Iraq, are pained about this circumstance. However, we understand the decision mentioned above because we know the reasons behind it and its objectives. This is because we who made that decision believe that a person may have to, under special circumstances, deter major harm with lesser harm. We also believe that any man is equal to his brother in humanitarian value, regardless of his color, race, or nationality. Therefore, deterring the harm of death, murder, and starving to death resulting from the U.S. policy which is directed against the people of Iraq, by prohibiting a number of citizens from traveling, is a gain to humanity as a whole.

I add, ladies and gentlemen, that many of our children and yours will become orphans if war breaks out. Many of our women and yours will become widows if war breaks out. And, many of our men and yours will die if war breaks out. At any rate, many of the Iraqis, who are equal in human value to others, will starve and some of them, particularly children and old people, will die if the economic embargo, which the U.S. Administration wants, is imposed according to its whim.

Therefore, and if any individual has to face such a scenario--which is realistic and tangible, and the worst of what can happen at any minute--he will comprehend the dilemma that affects us all as a result of the foreigners involved not being able to travel for some time until the clouds disappear. To deprive an individual from seeing his homeland for some time is better for him and for humanity as a whole than depriving thousands of people of life.

You know that all the Americans in the armed forces, along with others who belong to other nationalities, who were brought to this region and are now massing for an attack, are doing so, not because they want to, nor because they are convinced about the purpose of a war and came here from their homelands and families by themselves, but because their governments wanted this.

Therefore, let us all cooperate against those governments and stop them from committing their widespread crime and force them to withdraw their troops from the region, the presence of which may cause an intentional or unintentional spark that will set ablaze huge fire or bring about a deluge from which no one can escape.

To give everybody the opportunity to achieve peace, to disclose and expose those who want war and destruction, and to secure freedom for all, we put forward the following initiative:

1. The Security Council, with the approval of the United States, shall pledge that the United States will withdraw its forces from the region in accordance with a timetable not to exceed the time that these forces have been in the region. In addition, the Security Council shall pledge to Saudi Arabia that it will, collectively with the countries that abide by its resolution, stand against Iraq if it tries to attack Saudi Arabia. At the same time, both Iraq and Saudi Arabia shall pledge that neither of them will commit an act of aggression against the other or harm the interests of the other.

2. Alternatively, the Security Council shall pledge to secure peace and security in the entire region in accordance with the general basis contained in our initiative and the foreign forces shall withdraw from the sacred lands of Hijaz and Najd [Saudi Arabia]. This alternative, as we see it, is the option to achieve full and comprehensive peace and bring definite stability to the region and the world.

3. If either paragraph one or two above is accomplished, the foreigners shall be allowed to travel immediately as they choose.

4. If the above is not to be fulfilled on any excuse, then we will be content with the President of the United States making a clear, unequivocal commitment, in writing, to withdraw his forces and those of his allies from the land of the Arabs and the sanctities of the Muslims in accordance with a declared timetable not to exceed the time it took for the buildup, that he pledge not to use force against Iraq, that he declare his respect for international law and refrain from violating it, that he end the blockade of Iraq by all sides immediately, and that he deal with Iraq on the basis of mutual and reciprocal respect, each refraining from harming the interests of the other party.

For our part, and if the terms mentioned above are carried out, we will use our constitutional powers to allow the foreigners concerned to depart Iraq, each in accordance with his choice and decision.

5. The issue of Kuwait will be dealt with by the Arabs as an Arab issue, just as was done in all the other similar issues, such as the issue of the Sahara in the Arab Maghreb region between Morocco and the other parties concerned and the issue of Syria's occupation of Lebanon as well as other similar issues.

Brothers, sisters, and dear children: This is our initiative. I ask you: Is there anything in it that contradicts international law, is against humanity, or is contrary to the West's legitimate interests? If the answer is that the initiative is fair, then let us all cooperate to realize it. With this, peace, freedom, and tranquil life can be achieved for all.

Will the deaf ones hear? This is a question directed to the U.S. Administration in particular. With the correct answer to this question, many things can be achieved to serve humanity.

God's peace and blessings be upon you.

[signed] Saddam Hussein, on 19 August 1990

Open letter to U.S. President George Bush from President Saddam Hussein of 21 August 1990

In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate.

Once again, President Bush stands in front of Americans to twist words, hide motives or part of those motives, and mix the causes with the results. In his statement yesterday, 20 August 1990, in front of the American war veterans, he dealt with the issue of the Americans who are in Iraq and called them hostages. This despite the fact that the Iraqi statements have explained beyond a doubt that the situation of the Americans here is the result of a real aggression committed against the Arab nation and Iraq and that President Bush himself and his ally, Thatcher, are the ones who are carrying out this aggression. Had the aggression not been committed and had President Bush made a real assessment of the interests of the American people and citizens, Americans and others would not have faced what they have.

Despite this, what they have had to face so far is the lightest treatment imposed by the pressing circumstances even by American standards themselves. And how is this? President Bush knows--or I suppose he knows--that America itself held tens of thousands of its own nationals just because they were of Japanese origin. It based this act on the rule of choosing the lesser of two evils. If this precedent exists and is proven on the U.S. record, in addition to other precedents contained on the record of humankind, is it not a kind of racism to allow other states, including the American, that which is not allowed to Arabs, including Iraqis?

Despite all this, the Iraqis have clearly said that what took place is a kind of formula pressed upon us, not an option among many options. We are pained that this has happened.

Not allowing some foreigners to travel is not revenge, but deterrence of a crime of aggression President Bush intends to commit against the Iraqi people following his criminal occupation of the land of Kaaba and the tomb of the prophet, may God's prayers and blessings be upon him. If he commits such a crime, a big catastrophe will be inflicted not only on the region, but on the world.

President Bush went on to speak about outlaws. He makes a comparison--to make a point--between Iraq, and what it represents on one hand, and Hitler on the other. He forgets that all these descriptions apply to him. This is because Iraq did not bring its fleets and aircraft to attack America and Europe. It was President Bush and those who were dragged with him to the abyss who sent their ships and aircraft and came as invaders to our region. After desecrating the holy places and violating taboos, they want to kill the people and deprive them of their human rights. Is there any doubt of the application of these descriptions to Bush when he intends to ignite a war that would burn the entire world? Need there be more evidence of his disregard of all the initiatives and solutions which we have presented, whether with regard to the origin of the problem or with regard to the issue of the foreigners who are the result of the original problem?

It is definitely a mistake, even poor insight and wisdom, for the White House to reject our initiative of 12 August 1990 a few hours after it was announced on the air and before President Bush could look at the official text, out of fear that the translation was inaccurate or that the sentences were deficient for technical reasons.

Is this possible, President of the United States of America? Whoever does not want history to link him to the base characteristics of Hitler, must search thoroughly for peaceful means and not rush into preparations for war. What we presented in our initiative of 12 August 1990 and in our letter to the foreign families, who the National Assembly decided to host, is a clear way for anyone to distance himself from the base descriptions of Hitler.

We are among those who wish to be associated with all the characteristics of love and peace that are desired by the peoples of the world. At the same time, we defend, without fear from any arrogant and sinful tyrant or aggressor, the principles of our religion and holy shrines and the honor of the homeland and nation, even all the values of humanity combined.

It has become clear that claiming the U.S. forces came here to defend Saudi Arabia is an argument that holds no water in the face of contrary facts. This is because the reality on the ground confirms that Iraq does not intend to attack anyone, including Saudi Arabia. However, to say that your forces came here to defend American interests, you know that the Arabs, including Iraq, are not opposed to legitimate interests, whether of the West in general or the United States. You also know that prosperity, scientific and technical progress, and the promotion and flourishing of growth cannot be achieved in the way the Arabs hope without cooperation with the West. To achieve this, the Arabs have to sell oil; the major oil market is Europe and the United States, in addition to Japan.

I assume that President Bush knows that Iraq, for example, sold a third of its oil to the United States until 2 August 1990 and that Iraq was against the feverish price increases that took place in 1973. We have documents to prove it. At any rate, the Arabs, including Iraq, wish to sell their oil for all the purposes we have already mentioned, not to drink it or freeze it. The fact that Iraq owns, more or less, 20 percent of the world's oil reserves does not annul the principles we have already referred to. If whoever owns oil is boycotted by the world, it would be all the more reason for the world to boycott America and the Saudi Arabian Government. After all, is not food more vital to a human being than oil? We answer by saying yes. By all human standards, it is more vital than oil. The human being cannot survive without food.

If President Bush's criteria for boycotts, hostility, war, and siege are applicable to Iraq merely because it will, or that it already does, own 20 percent of the world's oil reserves, then it is all the more reason that these standards, in every sense, be applied to those who own the same percentage or more of food, primarily cereals.

Only then, the world must be against America and Australia primarily. If U.S. interests have become so small and narrow in Bush's view that they are restricted only to the narrow corner of relations between Bush and Fahd, and to their mutual interests--which precede Bush's assumption of the Presidency and coincided with the elections; and if their interests have become so narrow that they do not consider them as they should in terms of good and positive relations with a large and great nation, but consider them only with Jabir al-Ahmad, the Croesus of Kuwait, and his clique, who is unable to construct a useful sentence and who, along with people like him, has been a source of shame to the Arabs and proof to the West of their backwardness--then, you will be cursed by what you are doing.

Before concluding my letter, I would like to say that the source of capability and power, Mr. Bush, does not lie in the size of armies and technological superiority, nor in your alliance with those who betrayed their nation and people. It lies in the inclination toward right. However, God is greater and more powerful than everyone and, as we have previously said, America would not have been a superpower if it had not been influential in the world. In order to remain influential, it must respect the freedom of peoples and the freedom of nations to choose. It also must respect other people's sanctities and feeling. If you continue to ignore this, then I warn of the consequences, and I here record to history that your continuation in this policy will cause America to descend from its present status and it will lose many opportunities. In all circumstances, whether you choose war or boycott, you will lose and be defeated. And we will achieve victory, with God's help.

God is great, and let the lowly be accursed.

[Signed] Saddam Hussein, on 21 August 1990.

Excerpts of remarks exchanged between Saddam Hussein and some British families detained by Iraq at vital Iraqi installations on 23 August 1990

Hussein: Good morning. We've come to see how you are doing. You are British? All of you?

[Answer] Yes. We are a British family.

[Hussein] When did you come here?

[Answer] For myself, four days.

[Hussein] Are all your needs, whatever you require available? Are you getting your milk, Stewart?

[Answer] With corn flakes, too.

[Hussein] I do not think all the Iraqi kids can get corn flakes now. Do you have any younger one?

[Answer] I have a brother, fourteen.

[Hussein] Do you have enough place for exercise?

[Answer] Volleyball.

[Hussein] Go on say whatever you like. You are playing volleyball? . . .

[Hussein] And the ladies, how are you passing time? I am sure you prefer to be in Britain now. I am an Iraqi and I realize that if I were in your shoes I would rather be in Iraq, my country. But sometimes one is forced to face situations which are not of one's own choice. Your presence here and in other places is meant to prevent the scourge of war, to avoid the war. In Arabic, we say preventing danger. There is a semantic problem in the English language here. We, in our communique, used the dar' in Arabic, which means "to put away or to prevent or to avoid" the scourge of war or the danger of war. We use the word dar', which means in Arabic "to prevent." But when we used this word, the Western media used a different word. The pronunciation of the word dar' was changed into dar' [including the sound of the Arabic letter 'ayn], which means "shield." And they thought that we were using people as a shield rather than as a dar', which we meant, which means "to prevent" war. So there was perhaps deliberate misinterpretation or inadvertent misinterpretation of our wording of the communique.

[Hussein] Stewart, will, I am sure, be happy to have as part of life or his personal history that he played a role in maintaining peace. So when he, along with his friends and along with those present, here have played a role in preventing war, then they will be heroes of peace. I am sure that you all have your own journals, your own diaries, perhaps, and will jot down whatever you have as feelings or as recollections or as impressions of the day. And in any case your presence now and in this sort of atmosphere is not a source of pleasure to us. It does not make us happy. What would make us happy would be to see you back in your countries or to see you roaming the streets of Baghdad in the normal way, as you used to do. So please forgive us because we, like you, have our own children, like Stewart, and like Tan. And we also have our own women like you and have our own families. And we would know how you feel, but we are trying to prevent a war from happening. And we hope that your presence as guests here is not going to be for too long.

Now I am prepared to listen to whatever you would want to say and to receive whatever questions you may have. And would like you see you as comfortable as you wish to be in a democratic atmosphere, because we in fact here are more democratic than some quarters which claim for themselves to be, because in the past few days I have come across articles published in Western newspapers, so-called democratic newspapers, in which the writers urge the President to actually strike at Iraq and actually use force against Iraq and Baghdad despite the fact of your presence here. And this, in fact is a sign of the falsehood of this so-called democracy and their so-called concern for human life. Because they talk about human life and humanitarian issues and yet they urge President Bush to strike despite your presence.

We are truly concerned about your welfare and well-being here. We would want you to be safe and to return to your country. And this is not meant to be propaganda. I am not speaking for propaganda purposes, but it is truly a humanitarian concern that we want you to be safe. It is our religion, it is our duty, as both Iraqis, as Arabs, and as human beings that we would want you to be safe. We would like you to go back to your country, but I might say not because we are finding your-hospitality, or your presence as guests here, heavy on us. On the contrary, we only want you to have your freedom and go back to your country.

[Unidentified speaker] We appreciate that you have come in person, since nobody else had been able to answer questions.

[Hussein] I am here to answer all your questions.

[Unidentified speaker] You have school-going children here, right here. Who will begin, in about in a week's time, on the first of September.

[Hussein] As for schoolchildren, we hope that your presence here is not going to be long. But despite that, if by the time schooling begins and you are still here in Iraq, we are going to exert unusual efforts to make sure that the children are not deprived of their school years. And we will send to you experts from our Ministry of Education to see the curricula and the levels of schooling so that everything that we can prepare so that the children will not lose the opportunity.

All religions urge us to learn more and more, and to continue our learning. And in our religion, the first time God Almighty addressed the prophet Muhammad--blessings be upon his soul--through Gabriel, God said to Muhammad: "Read," and that was the first instruction. So, reading and learning is the fundamental thing in the life of a person, and we know what it means. One would have wished that the kind of circumstances could have been reversed. We would like to have the opportunity to see you in a different kind of situation. But it has happened, and we are faced with the outcome of actions, some of which have come by chance or coincidence, and some of which have come actually by deliberate scheme. But we, for our part, we shall try to treat you in the same way as we treat Iraqis, the people of Iraq, because you are not hostages.

We want nothing from Britain or the United States. We want nothing from them. They owe us nothing. We owe them nothing. The question should be addressed to them: What had Iraq taken away from you which has made you bring your forces threatening Iraq and the land and territory of God and the Muslims? What has Iraq done to deserve so? We have taken nothing from London or from any other English cities. We have taken nothing away from the United States.

We have our viewpoint, in any case the Arab nation is one nation, a single nation. British colonialism cut away the Arab nation. All that has happened. Now the rich part, called Kuwait, has come back to its motherland, the same as this little kid, which might have been taken away and then later brought back to his mother.

You are eager now to be in England, that I know, I am sure. If a segment or a part of England was to be cut away from the country, wouldn't this be bad, wouldn't you find it harmful? I am sure you would deplore this and you would not allow anybody to cut away any part of England. The same is true for the Iraqis. The Iraqis have decided that this part which had been cut away for a while from its motherland should come back to its motherland, same as this infant should come back to its mother.

We have taken nothing from England or from the United States. We have threatened none of them. We have said nothing about cutting away oil supplies to them. This is not our policy to cut off oil supplies. So, we do not want war despite the fact that you should know that whoever is on his native land, fighting in defense of his land will be able to destroy any aggression. We are in a position to stop any aggression.

If, in your position, in England, a force came to cut away or to occupy part of it, you would be in a position to destroy this force in defense of your honor, national honor and sense of your own future. Same thing, same feelings, same situation is here now. We do not want war to come about despite the fact that we know that we can smash and crush any attack that may take place.

So the question that has to be posed by all of us to Mrs. Thatcher and Mr. Bush is: What had Iraq taken away from them which has made them bring their armed forces to the region threatening the people of the area, threatening Iraq with an attack and destruction? What has Iraq done against them? Had Iraq taken anything from them and Iraq does not know it, let them tell us what we have taken away from them so that we may be able to return it to them. In my opinion they will fail to find anything. I am sure they will fail, and they will find that world public opinion will turn against them, even inside England and inside the United States. I am sure you would be able to see Arab public opinion, which direction it takes.

Arab public opinion is against foreign presence, or the presence of foreign forces on Arab territory. And if time drags on, with the presence of foreign forces still on our territory, you will find that the agents and regimes under foreign tutelage will fall one by one.

But in any case, I hope and I pray that your presence here in this kind of situation will not be long, and that you will go back to your country, and perhaps we will become friends. Any more questions?

[Question] We realize your determination. Our families know we know of your determination, but we would like them to know that we are well and in good health?

[Hussein] Yes, we shall make sure that your messages will reach your families in England. So, as of now, you can write your letters, and if you want to send photographs. . . .

[Hussein] I must say, I must be exact and accurate in saying to you now that, regrettably, nobody has conducted any negotiations or any dialogue as yet. Our foreign minister went to Amman and there he announced that Iraq would be prepared to get into negotiations. And the response came immediately after the foreign minister issued this statement--it was immediate, it was so quick--in this manner the U.S. Administration has responded to all our initiatives. They said immediately that they were not prepared to conduct any dialogue with Iraq before Iraq has withdrawn or left Kuwait, as if Kuwait were Washington. Our response is that neither the Iraqis, nor the Arabs in general, would be prepared to accept dialogue under blackmail. You will notice in this situation that there is accusation of being un-democratic. The Iraqis are now asking for dialogue when the so-called democratic West are refusing dialogue. But in any case, the situation will clear up. . . .

We have so far issued two initiatives. . . .

In any case, President Bush and others may learn a great deal from Iraq on the humanitarian level and even on the level of more accurate stands. And before all this, and more important than all of this, is the fact that the Iraqi people and the Arab nation will again teach them how to be civilized. I am happy to have met you and to know you, even though I would have preferred to have met you under different circumstances. I am going to

send a lady from the Women's Federation in Iraq so that she will be able to see what the women need regarding clothing. And I will tell them to make sure that you get all you need. . . .

Letter to American people from Sa'di Mahdi Salih, Speaker of the National Assembly, on 24 August 1990

In the name of God.

We send you greetings of civilization, freedom, and democracy, wishing you and all peoples of the world well being, happiness, and peace.

We have decided to address this message to you because we believe you will better understand and interact with us than President George Bush's administration does, because people better understand other people.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The Bush administration seeks to distort the image you have of the Iraqis and to depict them as terrorists and as harsh men who love war, as well as barbarians who have no consideration at all for international laws, the interests of other nations, and human values.

However, we the Iraqis are not like that. We are not what the Bush administration is describing us to be. We are an ancient people of successive human civilizations, the most ancient of which dates back to about 6,000 years ago. We are the nation of the Mesopotamia, the inheritors of Sumer, Akkad, Babylon, and Ashur. Our people were the first to invent writing and the first to promulgate laws and specify rights 4,500 years ago as detailed by the Hammurabi law. We were the first to establish schools, compose verses and epics, and formulate the most ancient mathematical and astrological theories.

And when the sun of Islam rose on the land of the Arabs, Iraq was the first to receive it and open its heart and mind to its light. Iraq strove for it and carried its banner to the world, and with Islam Iraq became a center of world civilization and its capital Baghdad the capital of peace when Europe itself was still plunged in the darkness of the Middle Ages.

This means, ladies and gentlemen, that civilization, the love of justice, and respect for law, and belief in God, have been handed down to the Iraqis and so became a built-in part of their psychological and spiritual fabric in contrast to Bush's contention and what he has been spreading about us. The Iraqis are at the same time as self-respecting a people as are the American people, and they will not have their dignity compromised nor their rights taken away from them or any one pointing guns at them. The Iraqi people are also a resilient, militant, and courageous people, as past history has shown them to be.

In short, the Iraqis are not what they are perceived to be by Mr. George Bush and painted by U.S. and other Western propaganda.

We the Iraqis are today, unjustifiably and under false pretexts, on the receiving end of a conspiracy led by and built up by the Bush administration. Just because we retrieved part of our country which British colonialism had built into a grand hotel called the State of Kuwait and installed there backward, subservient rulers, the Bush administration began making charges that now we want to invade Saudi Arabia, and now we threaten Western interests, including American interests. All this is sheer slander.

Like Iraq, Saudi Arabia is an Arab country and the two are bound by a non-aggression pact signed in 1989. We honor the agreement and abide by its letter and spirit. We have emphasized as much to Saudi Arabia and to the Bush administration and the international community, and we have stated our readiness to give sufficient guarantees bilaterally, or in an Arab or international context.

We do not want to threaten any interests of the United States or the West, or any other nation for that matter, since we have a vested interest in regional peace and in a smooth flow of oil to the world and the United States itself in an atmosphere of security and stability.

You must know that before the present crisis erupted we sold one third of our oil to the United States. Perhaps you do not know that we are now in possession of upward of 20 percent of the world's oil needs. Is it in our and the United States' interest that the entire region with its oil go up in flames?

Contrary to the Bush administration's perception of us, we respect others' legitimate interests and appreciate their circumstances and requirements and want to see oil sold at moderate prices; our policies within OPEC bear witness to that.

And more than anything else, we respect international law and are mindful of our responsibilities toward the world and appreciate the importance of the region in which we live and its impact on world politics. Only, we do not like anyone interfering in our domestic affairs, nor do we want for ourselves to become puppets manipulated by others. Neither will we have our dignity and freedom compromised or anyone dictate to us. All we want is for the Iraqi and Arab individual to enjoy the same rights as the Americans in their country.

These ambitions, we believe, are legitimate if others view them from a neutral perspective. However, it is obvious that Mr. Bush's administration has not understood this--or maybe it does not want to understand it. The Bush administration wants to decide for us what we should or should not do. It has not accepted the idea that the southern part of Iraq, Kuwait, should unite with its north, the way the south of the United States united with its north.

The Bush administration wants us to be like those submissive puppets it can manipulate with strings in certain parts of this world, including our region; this would be doing injustice to us, our history and future. Therefore, the Bush administration aroused the feelings of hostility held by some toward us, urged those who went along with it to impose an economic blockade on us, and started to prevent everything from reaching us, including food, medicine, and milk for the infants. It has also recruited fleets, squadrons of planes, and soldiers to commit aggression on us--an act of war and a violation of the UN Charter, whose clauses it interprets anyway it wants--and used all that is available to it from among the methods of persuasion, pressure, and enticement so that other countries would follow suit.

It seems, however, that the Bush administration has not considered in the least the results of what it has planned or put into action. Neither has it remembered the tragedy of Vietnam and the effects on the American people which they are suffering still today. Therefore, it found it easy to push American soldiers into the desolate desert quicksand. It has not taken notice that Iraq is not like Vietnam and that its weapons are not like those of Vietnam. It has not heeded what this aggression would cause for us--feelings of hostility and enmity toward the American people along with the millions of Arabs and Muslims who have begun to volunteer to join us.

Mr. Bush's administration has made itself believe that the Arabs are siding with it. It has not realized that Arabs are not like some of their rulers; they are the masses of the people who are seething with anger against it, and who are preparing to strike at U.S. interests should aggression start against us. Moreover, the Arabs are those nationalist honorable rulers who are clearly siding with us.

Ladies and gentlemen: It is easy for Mr. Bush to fan the flames of war, but it would be very difficult for us and you to bear its tragic consequences. Therefore, and to avoid together this outcome, we call on every American citizen who advocates right, justice, freedom, and peace to raise his voice in protest against the policies of Mr. Bush's administration toward us. We call them to ask Mr. Bush's administration to lift its illegitimate, inhuman blockade, and to stop the conspiracy to starve our people, kill our children, and inhibit our progress. We call them to ask Mr. Bush's administration to withdraw U.S. armies from Arab land and waters, and to stop humiliating our nation and Islamic sanctities. We call Mr. Bush, through you, by virtue of his being an American citizen, to reconsider his hostility toward Iraq before deliberating with his advisers, and to join the protesters, because this protest will render a service to the American and Iraqi people and to all the Arabs and humanity at large, because Mr. Bush is threatening to set a fire whose victims will undoubtedly be thousands of Americans and Arabs.

May God keep you and us away from the evil and atrocities of wars, and away from the evil of hatred and craving for revenge. Peace be upon him who thinks, contemplates, and follows the voice of reason and the call of conscience.

[Signed] Sa'di Mahdi Salih, speaker of the Iraqi National Assembly

Remarks by President Saddam Hussein during his visit with some families on 28 August 1990

I have been told that we have a birthday today. Happy birthday Rachel. Sometimes even unpleasant coincidences open chances for friendship and pleasant results. I appreciate, under the circumstance, as I earlier told your comrades, your feelings of annoyance at not being allowed to travel because, if I were in your place, or if my family were in your place, then I would have the same feeling.

However, politicians are forced sometimes to look at things in such a manner that is beyond what can be directly seen. For example, if it were to do with my human feelings toward you as individuals, I would have immediately said that you should leave. However, when we view matters through a wider perspective involving a much greater number of people and their destiny, be they foreigners or Iraqis. If a military conflagration takes place, God forbid, between Iraq and the armies brought by the United States and its allies; if we visualize the losses that will result from such a conflagration, if it were to happen; and if we view your presence here as guests of Iraq at a certain time as something that may prevent such a conflagration, or that this presence may contribute toward preventing such a conflagration, then we would find ourselves in predicament in which are compelled to take decision we have taken.

This means that a number of foreigners have been kept to prevent the death of many more foreigners. Of course, if war were to erupt, many Iraqis will also die, or, the way we look at it, will fall as martyrs, if the war were to take place, because they would be defending their homeland, their own existence, and their holy places.

As you know, the economic and scientific installations in Iraq operate round the clock and workers are accommodated within the same scientific and economic installations. If war erupts, these installations will be the

target of this war, as clearly stated by some Western officials and by Western media. Therefore, we expect that a large number of pretty Iraqi children, just like yours, would perish if these installations were to be attacked. Among the most important things that we should take into consideration is the inhuman act that the President of the United States has committed. It is he and his administration that should be asked why they have come to this area. Initially, they said they were coming to the area to defend Saudi Arabia.

Once the weakness of this pretext had been discovered, they began saying that they came to defend oil. I think that each and every one of you know--and you have lived in the region--that the people of the region do not intend to keep the oil in their pockets; they want to sell it to the United States, Japan, and Europe. The revenues from oil would be used in development, and Western and Japanese companies in general are the ones that help carry out development projects, whether in Iraq or other places. So the oil would be sold to the West, and the revenues from oil will be used in projects in the region executed by Western companies. The claim of defending oil, therefore, is groundless.

The question should be posed to the U.S. Administration: Why do you want to embroil the world and yourselves--the American people--in a war that, by all standards and by the simplest scenarios, will not be an easy war. You know, and I think that the politicians in your country know that we do not beg the sympathy of anybody. We respect the views of people. When we go out of our way and open a dialogue with you--and you are ordinary citizens--it is not because we want to beg sympathy from your governments. We want to express our respect for the human being. God almighty taught us that there is no difference between whites and blacks, Westerners and Easterners, Arabs and non-Arabs except in the manner in which they worship God.

The most difficult thing is to punish someone for doing something he did not know was prohibited. The war, if it erupts, will be a kind of severe punishment to people. As the Iraqis and the Arabs will lose sons, women, and children, the aggressive parties will also lose men, children and women. By this I mean the attackers and their allies.

If the United States attacks installations and the installations have children, women, and civilians accommodated inside them, these persons would be killed. The weaponry owned by Iraq might not be capable of reaching the United States, but it can reach its allies. When Iraq attacks installations and factories in cities, it is expected that children, women, men, and civilians inside the installations will also die, in addition to the soldiers who will die on the front in Iraq. This is of course in addition to the destruction in all aspects of life.

When we face such a possibility--not an easy possibility--it would not be wrong to enter into dialogue with peoples concerned about the outcome of such action, especially after we have found that doors are shut or half-shut by the concerned administrations as regards starting a dialogue and holding direct talks to find solutions which would rule out the scourge of war. When I conduct such a dialogue with you and before you--we coincidentally found at a place we visited that all those present were British--I do so, first because we respect the human being, and second, because we depend on dialogue to convey to the people the actual facts as they are and not as the deeply-involved parties wish to portray them to their people.

After the last meeting, we read the criticisms directed at us by some British politicians. They were very upset at the meeting. I do not see why they are so upset. It seems they were upset because they do not want the British people to learn facts from sources other than the British channels, which have become involved in faulty estimates. They even played a role in involving the U.S. Administration, in addition to the roles played by some of those called the allies of the United States in the region. Their estimates were extremely dangerous and mistaken. Consequently, they have pushed events to the point they have now reached.

Some Western politicians say that Iraq's measures are inhuman. I would agree with them that these measures are inhuman, had we had other options with which we could prevent the scourge of war.

I also agree that it would be inhuman if the objective is inhuman. If it is merely revenge or aimed at causing harm it is inhuman. But this is hosting under difficult circumstances--and I know it is under difficult circumstances--this is one of the factors to prevent war. Therefore, it should have another description.

For the sake of comparison even in this narrow field, in the wake of our measure, some Western states held Iraqis in order to keep them. Just because a number of their nationals were held, or hosted, a number of Iraqis were held. What will the situation be if what is taking place against Iraq is an attempt to invade Iraq, and not just holding a number of Iraqi citizens? What if the situation is reversed? If Iraq wanted to invade Paris, Washington, or London can we imagine the measures that would be taken by these states? They forgot all that they have been saying about democracy and freedom when they learned that some of their nationals are not allowed to travel outside Iraq; they held the Iraqi nationals who are in their states.

Despite these details, some of which might be wrong, the question should be addressed to the people who brought their fleets, air bases, and armies: Why have you come to invade Iraq? Why have you excluded the opportunity of an Arab solution and holding a dialogue to reach a political solution that will achieve tranquillity in the region away from war?

Now, I will try to answer your questions and anything related to your situation. We may think of dispatching some of you to carry a message of peace to your Western governments in which you address the direct

question: Why have you come to the region as invaders although your legitimate interests are guaranteed in accordance with all criteria--present and past? Those of you who will undertake this mission will be heroes of peace contrary to those who seek heroism through reckless adventure from which they will only harvest disappointment and loss.

The lecture is heavy, particularly on the children who do not understand politics. I am ready to answer your questions, suggestions, and needs.

[Question from an unidentified person] How can you leaders use children in an issue children cannot understand?

[Hussein] The question is legitimate and expected from a respectable lady like the one who put this question. I ask myself the same question, but in another way. My answer is: As far as I am concerned, being in charge here, the question is: Is it acceptable to kill people without a legitimate objective? Except in self-defense, is it acceptable to kill people? Even in the case of self defense, would it not be better if there was another means other than to kill in self-defense?

All of us have seen films about wars and know that if warplanes attack cities, they will kill beautiful Iraqi children just like the children sitting in front of me, and who have mothers too. Women will also be killed. This military buildup in the holy land came to strike at Iraq, to kill women, children, old men, as well as soldiers, who have neither attacked the United States nor Britain. My answer to the lady's question is that it is not acceptable to harm a human being outside the framework of self defense. Even a case such as that is a forced situation to which we have no alternative.

So for my part, as being in authority in Iraq, I am ready for a direct, immediate dialogue with Mr. Bush and Mrs. Thatcher. If they wish, so that the public opinion can learn the logic of the concerned parties so as to be able to pass fair judgments, let the debate between them and me be televised in front of world public opinion as a whole.

Therefore, Iraq, for its part, is neither responsible for detaining anybody, nor responsible for the intentional death of anybody, but Iraq found itself in a forced situation. Iraq believes that among the ways to prevent war is not allowing you to travel abroad until further notice.

[Comment by a man who is on a honeymoon with his wife] It would be better for us to be in our country rather than here, and that the best peace message is to be in touch with our families. We would like to be allowed to go to France to spend our honeymoon there where we can meet with fellow Frenchmen who are beginning to understand the situation and we can explain it.

[Hussein] I agree with what the questioner, who seems to be from France, has said. I said that from the humanitarian point of view, I am hurt as much as you are. Or let me say, to be accurate, some of you may be more hurt. I say I empathize as a human being due to the circumstances that led you to this situation. At any rate, I understand the humanitarian implications you are talking about, as being people who found themselves in a situation against their will. I am confident, or hope, that your stay here as forced guests will not be long.

[Question from an unidentified person] Is it possible to propose an initiative which could lead to a peaceful solution, and would such an initiative allow children and women to leave?

[Hussein] In the first place, anyone is expected to make such a proposal, which has been put forward by the U.S. gentleman who posed the question. However, I wish you to know that some states did not appreciate our decision to allow some citizens to leave. In other words, some states did not consider this a gesture of goodwill that could lead to an in-depth dialogue to ward off the scourge of war from the region.

Despite this, the proposal by the speaker is expected to come from anyone or any man because men always try to keep any harm from children and women. Despite this, the circumstances are difficult and people such as the Iraqis cannot make all the humanitarian choices they would like to make if the circumstances were different. Some of you might know the Iraqis and their character and can give them descriptions different from the descriptions given them by some governments. You might not have known that some of your governments have decided to deprive Iraq of food, children's milk, and medicine. Such a measure has never been taken before in the world.

Ladies and gentlemen: Do you not know that when children are deprived of milk their health becomes weak, they will not be able to resist disease, and hundreds, if not thousands, will die? Do you know how many men, women, and children will die if they have no medicine? Do you not know that a person will die if he is deprived of food? If Iraq had not taken precautions for such a possibility, people would die, and if the land of the Euphrates is not generous with the Iraqis, people will die. While you are here in our country you are aware that we have neither deprived you of food or medicines, nor deprived your children of milk. If there is any shortage, please let me know directly because the instructions are clear and firm: the children of our foreign guests should have milk, medicine, and food.

Therefore, the cutting off food and medicine is overt, not covert. It is not talk to a journalist; it is the current blockade. This is illegal. We asked Mr. Waldheim when he visited Iraq: Is there anything in the UN Charter that deprives people of food, medicine, and children's milk? He said that nothing in the UN Charter prevents this in any situation. However, this is the outcome of the American implementation of the idea of boycott

and embargo. The British Government is cooperating with it. Regrettable, the European and Japanese administrations have not said that this is unacceptable in human terms. How do you expect the situation would be if such a blockade were imposed on you in Britain or France? Would you not be angry against whoever imposed such a blockade on you to kill you, your children, and your sick people because of the lack of medicine? Despite this, I believe that you have noticed through your contact with the people that our people do not harbor any rancor against anyone; they hate the decisions and acts, but not the people. Those who make such decisions do not have sufficient knowledge about the Arab mentality or Iraqi mentality.

The Iraqis are ready to eat dirt and to not bow their heads to the aggressive invaders. I think they want to be the object of your respect and that of the world when they prove to the tyrants that they are people who can live without accepting humiliation and disgrace. The next months and years will prove--if the blockade lasts for year--that all estimations made on the basis that the blockade can subjugate the Iraqis are incorrect and baseless.

The president: I thank the French lady for her flattery. For, after all, I am only a human being who needs the ordinary people to tell him what is right and what is wrong concerning his conduct, because God Almighty has taught us such principles, when He said in His Holy Book, the *Quran*: "If ye are grateful, I will add more favors unto you." This address is from God to man. You, as believers, know that God does only what is right; nevertheless, He asks man, who is his own creation, to thank him. God Almighty uses dialogue to convince his servant, the human being. So, we, the servants of God, no matter how intelligent anyone of us is, still need the help of each other to attain the image that we are supposed to attain, in human terms.

I thank the lady for this flattery and I say to her: Yes, all French politicians are our friends. We had expected them, before doing anything, to talk with us and ask us about right and wrong, so that we could answer them. Regrettably, however, they have not done so.

Proceeding from this, therefore, and depending on other evidence that we found through our links with other countries, it became clear to us that the United States has reached a degree of arrogance and brute force--here, I mean the U.S. Administration, not the U.S. citizen--to the extent that there is no longer anyone who can simply say no, when this no is addressed to the United States. It seems that the economy and its repercussions in Europe have reached a point that is sometimes--unless the Europeans take notice of this--at the expense of their humanity. For what can the United States use to pressure the Soviet Union, France, or Italy? It can use the economy to apply this pressure. It seems that some political leaders of these countries are no longer capable of withstanding such pressure. Therefore, they have begun to appease the United States to the degree that this appeasement is a danger not only to the whole of humanity, but to Europe itself. It is obvious, therefore, that although Iraq is a friend of France--and we suppose that France can initiate a dialogue with Iraq through open doors--we do not know why some French politicians have committed such a series of mistakes to appease the dangerous U.S. policy.

If America's desire is to control the oil of the Middle East to the extent of being able to dictate to France, England, Italy, or Japan, the amount of oil, its type, and price, and a list of the amounts to reach European markets, and if America finds this to be in its interest, then is it in Europe's interest to see this happen? If this question were addressed to anyone who lives within the oil regions, he would say that it is not in Europe's interest or Japan's that America should take hold of Middle East oil, to the extent of allotting their quotas. Regardless of this debate, all Europeans and Japanese know that if war breaks out, not only might the oil fields in Iraq be set on fire, but also in other areas. They also know that if this happens, a good deal of the amount allotted to them will be cut off, because when the oil is ablaze it cannot flow to France, England, or Japan. At any rate, America will be in a better position to acquire its quota than Europe or Japan. It is certain, nevertheless, that even the United States itself will be affected.

It is not in anyone's interest, therefore, to see a war in the region. Why are they, then, pushing things toward the verge of the abyss? I think it weakness. The French need to invoke de Gaulle's spirit of the independent decision. While saying this, I do not intend to instigate Europe against the United States. We want peace; we do not want conflict. I want to say, however, through this quick human survey of what we have said, in addition to the miserable condition of humanity in Third World countries, that the United States should not dominate humanity or it will become tyrannical; because if it becomes tyrannical, it will lose its humanity and others will lose their humanity. This is because when someone becomes tyrannical, he cannot see the basic conditions for others to enjoy their humanity. It is clear, therefore, that the United States does not have to win the military battle in order to confirm the humanity of the American citizen. On the contrary, if the United States wins the military battle against us, the American will lose his humanity and many will lose their humanity as well, while we, the Arabs and the Iraqis, should not be defeated by aggression. Our humanity dictates that we should not be defeated. In fact, the humanity of the entire world dictates that Iraq and the Arabs should not be defeated by aggression so that we can avoid disasters. Only God Almighty can be just when He dominates humanity. God, as you know, is already dominating humanity, because He is the One and Only One.

[Hussein] We have taken this into consideration and are preparing ourselves for such a possibility. Yet, despite the fact that we are preparing to face such a possibility, we are not working toward this end.

[Rather] I think many Americans are concerned that there may be a war. The question they want to know is who is that man, Saddam Hussein. How would you describe yourself?

[Hussein, first addressing interpreter] Before thinking that they are greatly interested to know who Saddam Hussein is, does he not think they would first like to know the way to prevent a war? I believe the Americans' concern is correct and legitimate. The Iraqis, like the Americans, do not want war. Therefore, in the name of the Iraqis, I say that I do not want war. What Mr. Bush needs to do is tell the Americans that he does not want war. Then, war will not take place.

As for who Saddam Hussein is, Saddam Hussein is the man sitting in front of you. You and all politicians and media men in the United States know who Saddam Hussein is because Saddam Hussein is not locked up in a vault. A human being is known from his history, so you can tell the public exactly who Saddam Hussein is.

[Rather] President Bush has said that you are to be equated with Hitler, that you are a bully and a very dangerous man.

[Hussein] From which angle did Mr. Bush choose to compare me to Hitler?

[Rather] You invaded a weak neighbor who is no threat to you.

[Hussein] Do you realize how wicked those in authority in that country, which you call weak, were? As a U.S. citizen who should honor his U.S. citizenship by telling the truth, you must know how wicked the al-Sabah family were. Only in 1963, the border station between what was formerly called the state of Kuwait and Iraq was in an area called al-Mitla'. That was in 1963. From 1963 until 2 August 1990, this point continued to move until it reached an area called al-'Abdali. Do you know how far al-'Abdali is from al-Mitla'? Over 70 km. All this took place because we in Iraq did not have stable governments from 1963 to 1968. From 1968 to 1970 the new government was not stable enough. I am talking about something based on documents that we can provide you with. Before the war with Iran in 1980, the value of the Iraqi dinar was higher than that of the Kuwaiti dinar. Do you know what the value of the Iraqi dinar was on 2 August? The value was only 54 Kuwaiti fils, which means 1/19th of the former value of the Iraqi dinar. The party responsible for this state of affairs was Kuwait. Is this a weak government? It is a wicked government. It was the claw of a wolf. The rulers of this part wanted Iraq, which is larger than their part, to be brought down to earth.

[Rather] If I may, I know that you did not like Kuwait. I would like to know the circumstances?

[Hussein] I hope that you will see the documents in which we warned against this behavior, and I also hope that you will see the statements that I made at the Baghdad summit held prior to the events.

[Rather] Americans simply can't accept a man who takes hostages. How can you defend that?

[Hussein] Taking hostages means to hold a person and demand something in return. What have we asked from the United States in return? We have asked for nothing.

[Rather] But you asked not to be attacked?

[Hussein] We said we want peace. And we said that perhaps the U.S. Administration would be influenced by U.S. public opinion if they knew that it would attack Iraq despite the fact that there were U.S. citizens in Iraq.

Therefore, we kept a number of foreigners in Iraq and did not allow them to travel outside Iraq--for a while, not for good. And when I visited and met with the foreign families yesterday, I felt that they wanted their children and women to be allowed to leave. I consulted with the speaker of the National Assembly, exercised my powers, and allowed them to depart.

Therefore, we have not taken anyone hostage in exchange for anything. We do not want anything. We do not want war to break out, because if it does, it will harm the United States, Iraq, and humanity in general.

[Rather] Mr. President, respectfully, a hostage is a hostage. I have to believe that you, an intelligent person, know that these people are hostages.

[Hussein] If this is understood as such, why did the Americans detain tens of thousands of Japanese during World War II? Some of them, most of them, were U.S. nationals. Therefore, the Americans committed two acts of detention. First they detained a human being, and second, they detained a U.S. national with citizenship rights.

[Rather] I do not want to defend that, but it was a long time ago, a different situation. Would you consider letting all of the hostages go?

[Hussein] Why different? Was not the justification for detaining those Japanese and Americans that you did not want the war to drag on?

[Rather] No, it was done for internal security.

[Hussein] We are doing it for the sake of peace, which is a more sublime objective than internal security.

[Rather] Let me ask: One of your Iraqi officials said to me in private: What we have now is a kind of balance of terror. Do you agree that what we have now is a kind of balance of terror between the United States and Iraq; you have the hostages and we have a huge military force?

[Hussein] No, we do not believe this. The man who told you that does not know our policy: that is, if someone really told you this. You must have heard my remarks to our foreign guests. I recommend that if a raid were launched against the place where they are and there is a shelter, those in charge should allow the foreigners to enter the shelter first and then the Iraqis. If we wanted to strike a balance of so-called terror, we would not have given preference to foreigners over Iraqis in entering the shelters. But we are still considering them our guests. In Arab tradition, the guest is dealt with on this basis. He comes before the people in the house.

Let me as you as an American--I will also ask you questions if you will allow me--don't you in America wonder how this situation is different from that in Grenada and Panama? We say that Kuwait is a part of Iraq and we have the documents to prove it. As for Panama and Grenada, they have never been parts of the United States of America. Yet, you invaded Panama and Grenada. You brought the leader of Panama to the United States to try him there. Don't the American people ask their government about this double standard treatment? One the one hand, armies are dispatched to Iraq because it extended into its other part; namely Kuwait; and on the other hand, the U.S. action in Grenada and Panama is considered to be a correct action, a legitimate and constitutional action.

[Rather] First of all, my job is to ask questions not to answer questions. These questions are better directed to President Bush.

[Hussein] Then I put it to President Bush, and were he to answer that he went into Grenada and Panama, but he kept neither, I would tell him that had they been part of the United States, he would have retained them.

[Rather] . . . When I saw you on television with the families, with what you call "guests" and I call "hostages," with the British boy and his family, I was very uncomfortable with that, and that I think many Americans and others were uncomfortable and outraged by it. Why did you do it?

[Hussein] We have said that foreigners, those you call "hostages," are our guests. It is a habit with me to see the field before I decide anything, and when the issue has to do with human beings, then I take great care to see the situation for myself before I decide on anything. It is my duty to see for myself how these foreigners are doing rather than depend on secondhand accounts. Which is why I have been to see them twice. And I asked them about their private and general affairs, and I learned some very valuable human lessons. For example, regardless of assurances given to the foreigners as to the women's safety and comfort, I discovered that the women were not really comfortable. And my conversation with them led me to believe that Arab mentality and morality might be misunderstood--old values and our glorious past that we want to maintain. I, therefore, talked to a number of my comrades and the speaker of the National Assembly, and we decided to let the children and women leave the country, stay, or return whenever they want. The aim of the meeting was prompted by humanitarian grounds.

[Rather] Would you consider letting all of the hostages leave, Mr. President?

[Hussein] We wish this thing had not happened in the first place. It is only natural for us to feel the heavy burden of the situation on us just as the guests we were compelled to host feel the heavy burden of the situation.

[Rather] I want to make sure that I understand; So the answer is no, you will not consider letting the other hostages go?

[Hussein] As we consider it, a decision will be made.

[Rather] Mr. President, you have proposed a debate with President Bush and with Prime Minister Thatcher--are you serious about it?

[Hussein] I am very serious.

[Rather] But why, what will that accomplish?

[Hussein] Do not the Western nations like dialogues through which they can learn facts? We are often told the Western nations like dialogues, discussions, and innovation. However, we see some of them avoiding dialogue and innovation. They also refuse to view matters flexibly. For instance, based on declared Western values, we thought that as we used to be abused by others because of the practices of Jabir al-Ahmad al-Sabah, his removal would be greeted with relief in some quarters regardless of disagreements on other viewpoints. However, we found that the biggest power in the world--the United States--came to invade the region under the slogan of returning this backward person--a person who knows nothing but possessing women and money and who can hardly manage to construct a full sentence. This power came to invade the land of the Kaaba and the tomb of the prophet in order to return Jabir al-Ahmad to power. There is a contradiction in this.

[Rather] Excuse me, Mr. President. Respectfully, it is you who invaded another country, not the United States who invaded any country.

[Hussein] Yes, but did you not use to abuse the Arabs because of the behavior of Jabir al-Ahmad and the like, whom you see in Europe and America?

[Rather] My answer to that is no. But let me move on. I want to get back to this idea of the debate. Where would this take place and when?

[Hussein] Any time, starting this moment. I meant a televised debate. But if a dialogue is wanted, I am ready as of this moment for a direct dialogue with Mr. Bush and Mrs. Thatcher, together or separately. If they

[Comment from an unidentified person] As far as I know, not all the members of the same families are here. I would like to say to those who see this film that not all the families are here, but that all of our families are in good health.

It goes without saying that we have come to this place without anyone telling us what to say, what questions we can and cannot ask, and how to answer this or that question. The world does not know this.

[Request from an unidentified person] We have been in contact with our embassies for the past 11 days. We were unable to contact our families, and we neither received, nor sent letters to them. We hope that something will be done in this respect.

[Hussein] Things will improve in the future. We have given orders that you will always be allowed to exchange letters with your families.

[Question from an unidentified person] I have two questions of a political nature. How do you intend to secure peace in this region and when will this be? And what are your conditions for peace?

[Hussein] We have no conditions and do not want to take anything from anybody. However, we refuse to give in to illegitimate demands from others. For example, we do not want to attack anybody, but we will confront any attack against us.

If some people want to secure the continued flow of oil, we would like to tell them that we produce oil to sell it to them. Kuwait is part of Iraq and not the 52nd U.S. state.

Those who say that we want to attack Saudi Arabia, are saying inaccurate and untrue things. What we want is to live in dignity in our country and let others live in dignity in their country. If the foreigners cannot understand our problems, let them leave us as Arabs to solve our problems ourselves. We are more capable of solving them, as we have no other choice.

[Question from an unidentified person] Thank you. Another question: We are living near Baghdad: Is there a shelter in this place in case something happens?

[Hussein] You will be the first to enter the shelter. First, the children, then the women, and then men, and finally the Iraqis.

[Request from an unidentified person] Thanks. Is it possible to arrange for visits by a Japanese physician, because we have sick people? Regrettably, we do not speak any other language. As for Japanese, nobody speaks it here. If this is possible.

[Hussein] I think we have an Army physician who knows Japanese. We will send you an Iraqi physician who knows Japanese, address your government in this regard, or send a translator to translate into Japanese to work with an Iraqi physician.

[Comment from an unidentified person] The Japanese Embassy in Baghdad has a Japanese physician.

[Hussein] Despite this, we will secure for you a physician who speaks Japanese, or supply the physician with a translator who knows Japanese.

[Unidentified person] Thank you, sir.

[Request from an unidentified person] My question, Mr. President, concerns the same question addressed by the one to my right regarding letters. In addition to the usual letters, we know that there are letters that can be also addressed through telephone or telex. Our embassies in Iraq can get us telex messages. Would it be possible to install a device in our places to ensure that we continue to receive such messages?

[Hussein] I asked the secretary, to maintain continuous contact with your embassies through the Foreign Ministry so that the letters that reach your embassies can be received and given to you. We might consider a post office box that you can use for your mail. Thus, your correspondence would be collected daily and sent to you and from you to your relatives. . . .

[Unidentified person] I have another request. You know that all those present in this session were separated from their wives last night for the sake of this meeting.

[Hussein] You will return to your wives. As for the wives, they will return to their husbands. We just wanted to see some of you.

[Unidentified woman] I would like to say that we are receiving very good treatment where we are living right now. Our needs are being met to the best possible extent, considering what is available in these places. I am saying this of my own volition. Nobody has asked me to say it. Thanks.

[Hussein] We would like to see you comfortable. By this, I am referring to relative comfort. Of course, you will be more comfortable when you are in your own country and when you come back under peaceful circumstances. We will do our best in this regard. Whenever we find a mistake, it is certainly not a deliberate mistake. Anyhow, we wish you good luck. We also hope you will go home as soon as possible and also that war will not break out.

Interview with Saddam Hussein by Dan Rather of CBS Television Network in Baghdad on 29 August 1990

[Rather] Mr. President, your Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister said a few days ago that the door was not closed to any idea. Does that include the idea of possibly Iraq withdrawing from Kuwait under any circumstances?

[Hussein] At any rate, the Foreign Minister spoke within the framework of the general situation, Kuwait is part of a general situation. You know that the U.S. troops are currently occupying the lands considered to be holy to Arabs and Muslims. Moreover, a blockade is being imposed on Iraq. There is a military buildup. There is a massive buildup of troops by the United States and its allies. One of the issues relating to this is possible aggression against Iraq. Then comes Kuwait as one of these numerous factors.

[Rather] But is it negotiable? Is it negotiable or non negotiable?

[Hussein] If you are talking about withdrawal, then there would be nothing left to negotiate about. When a man, including government officials in any world state, faces any, problem, he cannot say that there is no solution or that there is no room for proposing any new idea. When you say that there is no room for any new ideas: then life, as we said a short while ago, would cease to function. Only a rigid mentality would say there is no room for new ideas.

[Rather] So, it is negotiable?

[Hussein] Negotiable with whom?

[Rather] With the United States.

[Hussein] Is Kuwait the 52nd state of the United States?

[Rather] No, you have said it is the 19th province of Iraq.

[Hussein] So, we are talking about dialogue, not negotiations. Negotiations are held with the concerned parties. The United States has thus far been saying that it has been asked to send troops by Saudi Arabia, by the Saudi Government, and that it came in response to this request. The United States did not tell us that it was the legitimate heir of the previous government of Kuwait so we would hold negotiations with it. Consequently, we would negotiate the withdrawal of the United States from the holy places if the Muslims and Arabs asked us to negotiate on their behalf. But since the Arabs and Muslims have not asked us to perform this duty, we should say that we are ready to enter into a dialogue, rather than negotiations, with the United States.

[Rather] But that would include the possibility of your withdrawing from from Kuwait?

[Hussein] Kuwait is part of Iraq.

[Rather] Forever?

[Hussein] We have made our words clear on this. The Iraqi legislative authorities issued a clear decision saying that Kuwait is an Iraqi governorate.

Do you think that U.S. citizens or the U.S. officials have a sufficient background about Kuwait being part of Iraq? Or have they viewed the issue only from the perspective that Kuwait was a state, that the Iraqi Army is now in Kuwait, and that the Kuwaiti Government is now out of Kuwait? And that therefore, in accordance with human and international criteria, the only duty for everyone is to denounce this action?

For instance, do Americans know that the Kuwaiti Legislative Council decided in 1938 to rejoin Iraq on the basis that Kuwait was part of Iraq? Do they know, moreover, that this Council was dissolved because it decided twice to rejoin Iraq? This was done on instructions from the British authorities carried out by the Kuwaiti shaikhs. Do Americans know, for instance, that the Iraqi Government has not recognized the presence of any other legislative body that can make such a decision within or outside the state of Kuwait?

So, Kuwait is different from Saudi Arabia. We could understand when someone says that he is worried about Saudi Arabia if there were a real danger threatening Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia is an independent state that has never been a part of Iraq. Neither has Iraq been at any time a part of it. As for Kuwait, the matter is different.

[Rather] May I change this subject for just a moment, Mr. President? There was a report today in the United States that--from several back channels, from several sources--that you have offered to negotiate an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait provided that you will get some of the islands that belong to Kuwait and you will get one of Kuwait's major oil fields, and that the debt to Kuwait for the war would be forgiven. Is that report true?

[Hussein] So far we have not met with the UN secretary general. We have not said this to anyone. Nevertheless, when any proposal is presented to us, we will give our opinion on it. But who would suggest the proposal to us?

[Rather] Well, Mr. Perez de Cuellar has been submitting proposals.

[Hussein] So far we have not met with Mr. Perez de Cuellar. If he suggests any idea to the Foreign Minister when they meet, the Foreign Minister will discuss the idea with him. We respect Mr. Perez de Cuellar in his capacity as a UN representative.

[Rather] Do you expect a United States military strike against you?

wish a televised debate, my essential condition is that it be live, with no chance for editing the tape, so that citizens could see exactly what takes place.

[Rather] Would you see this happening, for example, at the United Nations?

[Hussein] Through whatever means or form. What is important is for the dialogue to take place. It does not matter how.

[Rather] Why is this so important to you?

[Hussein] Is dialogue not important for human beings so they can learn the viewpoints of each other and so that the mistaken can correct his mistake and he who is correct can stick to his position?

[Interpreter in Arabic to Rather and Hussein] We are talking about the televised debate?

[Rather] Yes.

[Hussein] Yes.

[Interpreter] Why is it important?

[Hussein] The televised debate is important for me so that public opinion will know the facts as they truly are, not as the rulers say, whether this public opinion is Arab--in which I am interested--or foreign--in which Mr. Bush and Mrs. Thatcher are interested. This is important as well for the common denominator among the three of us, which is the human dimension, so that all world peoples will know the facts as they truly are through their own assessment of the debate between the three concerned parties.

[Rather] The Bush Administration today calls this idea, and I quote, "sick."

[Hussein] Why is it sick? You, as a U.S. national have to ask the U.S. Administration why an open and direct dialogue that would make citizens in the countries concerned and the world public in general aware of facts as they are, or as they can be deduced through a dialogue, should be described as sick.

[Rather] Mr. President, are you willing to take your claim to Kuwait to the World Court and abide by its decision, to the World Court, the International Court of Justice?

[Hussein] Such a measure could have been taken before 2 August. However, if a comprehensive and durable peace is to be attained in the region, we know that all concerned parties must make some sacrifices. On the basis of this feeling, we proposed our initiative on 12 August. We said that if all the region's problems were to be resolved to ensure that regional problems are settled in accordance with the same bases and standards, the international community must heed all resolutions issued on similar issues by the UN Security Council and which have so far been left unimplemented. The reference here is to the Palestine question, the Arab-Zionist conflict, the occupation of Lebanon, and before we launched our initiative toward Iran--the issue of the Iraq-Iran war. We included in our initiative the Western Sahara issue, as well as the Kuwaiti issue. This initiative was declared before the launching of the initiative that resolved matters with Iran. We proposed that all these issues be resolved in accordance with clear standards and principles. As for the Kuwaiti issue, historical facts and the status quo should provide the background for any solution to it. However, Mr. Bush rejected the initiative within hours, even before asking for the official text of the initiative.

[Rather] Well, I believe he considered it to be unrealistic.

[Hussein] Why unrealistic? When the occupation is Zionist, it is considered to be legitimate. When the Zionists occupied Arab lands, it was considered legitimate by Bush. But when the mother restores her child who was snatched away from her, this is considered illegal for Iraq, this is a reason for him to bring in his troops, and to occupy the Kaaba, and the prophet's tomb. This is the double standard in Mr. Bush's way of thinking.

[Rather] Mr. President, again, you are an intelligent person, and you recognize the difference. Israel that has been surrounded by neighbors who want to destroy her and a weak neighbor of yours who didn't want to destroy you.

[Hussein] First, regarding the talk that Israel's neighbors seek its destruction, I do not believe that any Arab is calling for destroying the Israel of the Jewish identity. But, it is only natural for the Arabs to say that the occupier must leave our lands and that if he does not leave our lands through politics, he must realize that the Arabs will be forced one day to make him leave their lands in other ways.

With regard to the rulers of Kuwait, yes, they did want to destroy Iraq. The rulers of Kuwait wanted to destroy Iraq. We clearly said this to them in front of all the Arab kings and presidents who were meeting in Baghdad. We have a document which we can give to you showing that we said this to them. What is taking place against Iraq is war. If you do not mean to wage war, you should review your policy that aims to destroy the Iraqi economy. But what happened later is that things became worse and worse.

[Rather] I want to ask you Mr. President: This last weekend I interviewed your friend Husni Mubarak, President of Egypt.

[Hussein] He was my friend.

[Rather] He says he is still a friend.

[Hussein] To me, he no longer is.

[Rather] Here's what he told me. This is a paraphrase, but it is accurate. He said: Either way, Saddam Hussein is through, finished. If he stays in Kuwait, he will be destroyed by military power. If he withdraws from Kuwait he will lose credibility, he will lose face, and so he will be finished.

[Hussein] If this is what he said, he should be one of the decision makers in the Pentagon, not the President of the Arab state of Egypt. If he is really the President of the Arab state of Egypt he would not have said this, even if he wished it. If he is one of the decision makers of the Pentagon, he will commit the same mistake the relevant people in the Pentagon will commit if they believe they can destroy Iraq. History will show us. That is, within a few months, weeks, and years the one who knows the right course of history and who knows what the real feelings among Arabs is, will emerge. I am saying this, of course, supposing that what you told me about Mr. Mubarak is correct.

[Rather] That's it exactly, Mr. President. Your Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister told me in an interview that Iraq would not use poison gas or biological weapons unless attacked with nuclear weapons itself. Are you prepared to give this commitment?

[Hussein] We have made enough statements on this issue. If what is meant is the situation with Israel, we spoke about this a great deal.

[Rather] No, we properly speak about the situation with the United States.

[Hussein] In all cases, we will not give Iraq to anybody. Iraq exists to live in dignity.

[Rather] So, you might use poison gas in defense of Iraq, to save Iraq?

[Hussein] I have not said that. I say: Iraq is an independent and sovereign state. And whoever attacks Iraq to change the ruling system and destroy this country should know that Iraq will not be an easy target.

[Rather] Do you think, Mr. President, that this will be Vietnam in the sand for the United States?

[Hussein] We do not hope that the United States will face the tragedies it faced in Vietnam and neither do we hope that the Iraqis and the Arabs will face the same tragedies the Vietnamese faced in the war between the United States and the Vietnamese. But, if the war breaks out between the United States and Iraq, representing the Arabs, I think that the United States will no longer be superpower number one. And the harm that will be inflicted on the invaders will be even more severe than what they experienced in Vietnam, and Iraq will come out on top.

[Rather] I think that you under estimate the power of the United States, what are the chances that a quick, powerful strike could knock you out immediately?

[Hussein] There is no powerful and quick strike that any nation could deliver, whatever their overall power. The United States depends on the Air Force. The Air Force has never decided a war in the history of wars. In the early days of the war between us and Iran, the Iranians had an edge in the air. They had approximately 600 aircraft, all U.S.-made and whose pilots received training in the United States. They flew to Baghdad like black clouds, but they did not determine the outcome of the battle. In later years, our air force gained supremacy, and yet it was not our air force that settled the war. The United States may be able to destroy cities, factories and to kill, but it will not be able to decide the war with its Air Force. This is in terms of the relationship between technology and our fighters, within the framework of war. But otherwise, God is with us, and Satan is with the U.S. Administration. Can Satan defeat God?

[Rather] Every soldier I ever met believes God is on his side.

[Hussein] Yet there remains a difference between one coming all the way from the United States to occupy Hejaz and Najd [Saudi Arabia] and one sitting in his home among his kinfolk without committing aggression against the United States.

[Rather] If you are attacked by the United States from Saudi territory or any place else, will your promise not to attack Saudi Arabia still hold?

[Hussein] In the event we are attacked from Saudi territory, the situation will be different. And if we are attacked from other territories, the situation will also be different.

[Rather] Sir, we are nearing the end of our time. I appreciate your generosity. But what is happening now is going to drastically change the balance of forces in the Middle East. Do you agree with that?

[Hussein] Yes, I agree, if the situation should develop into war. But if the crisis finds a political solution, things will take a different course.

[Rather] Is there anything that you want to say to President Bush, if you could speak to him directly.

[Hussein] I have nothing to say, except that before he involves the United States in a difficult situation, he should think a great deal and consult with people who might be able give him accurate and correct information on the region and the background of the issue of Kuwait in regard to Iraq.

[Rather] Do you have any new proposals to make?

[Hussein] If a dialogue begins, we are sure to have a good many things to say, just as they would have many things to tell us. But if war breaks out, we will not bear the sin of starting it.

[Rather] Mr. President, I thank you for your time.

[Hussein] My pleasure.

Interview with Saddam Hussein by Jesse Jackson in Baghdad on 31 August 1990

[Hussein] Today we are meeting with Jackson, the journalist.

[Jackson] Yes, Mr. President, Iraq is now the focus of world attention and the war clouds are gathering in this part of the world. You are in a position to stop the war, safeguard Iraq's security and honor, and reshape world policy. How do you view the true basis of the conflict between Iraq and Kuwait?

[Hussein] So we have begun now with Jackson, the journalist?

[Jackson] Yes.

[Hussein] At any rate, and regardless of whether the situation remains peaceful or turns into war, Iraq's honor will continue to be safeguarded and preserved. I believe that if every straightforward individual is able to achieve the objectives of his people peacefully, it would be better.

In our meeting yesterday as politicians, when you put a similar question to me, I told you that your question was perhaps incriminatory, albeit unintentional, especially when you said that Iraq can achieve peace and when you asked about what Iraq can offer to appear peaceful in the eyes of certain U.S. politicians.

It seems what is required now, not just by Jackson, but also other U.S. politicians before him, is for Iraq to submit to the U.S. will for no reason except that the United States and those who have succumbed to its wish have brought in all these fleets. Iraq will not submit under these considerations. However, as far as declaring our desire for peace and meeting or utilizing every opportunity to serve peace, Iraq's intentions are clear, Iraq is always ready to serve peace while safeguarding its legitimate human and political rights.

[Jackson] Mr. President, there are two demands. There were demands before 2 August and demands after that which people did not hear about.

[Hussein] Demands from whom?

[Jackson] Demands from Iraq concerning the conflict with Kuwait. New demands by Iraq also came up after 2 August. Could you explain that. The first demands concerned economic prosperity and the achievement of economic justice. Later, other demands came up concerning the annexation of Kuwait. Could you explain that?

[Hussein] Kuwait was a province in the Ottoman state. This fact existed until the beginning of World War I. Then, as a result of the war and within the context of the atmosphere of and the preparation for that war, the southern part of Iraq was severed, thereby depriving Iraq of the sea. This southern part used to be called the Kuwait District. It followed the al-Basrah Governorate. The district officer was the grandfather of the ruling Kuwaiti family. He received his official salary from al-Basrah Governorate. This district was then turned into an emirate. Later, the emirate was granted the status of a state in accordance with a decision by the British Government in 1961. Iraq did not recognize that. Iraq's border was also not demarcated with this so-called state. Iraq has not passed any legislative decision recognizing this border until 2 August.

[Jackson] Mr. President, until 2 August you were negotiating with Kuwait on the need for fair oil prices. You were also negotiating about Kuwait stealing oil and the repayment of debts. The Arab League and the United Nations have recognized Kuwait as a state and you also have recognized it as such until 2 August?

[Hussein] There has never been any decision by an authorized legislative quarter recognizing Kuwait as a state and demarcating the border with it. What took place was a *de facto* dealing, such as the exchange of ambassadors. This was what took place with the so-called State of Kuwait. Still, had the government in charge of Kuwait dealt with us honestly, we would not, perhaps, have reached the situation we reached on 2 August.

[Jackson] What did you demand during these negotiations?

[Hussein] Before I say what we demanded, it should be noted that there are unjust assertions by the U.S. media, and unjust policies, in particular, as well by some European capitals. You remember the subsequent stories about the chemical, "Bazoft" and many other things. All that was linked to a Zionist scheme based on the desire to destroy Iraq. They thought they could achieve that objective through the Iraq-Iran war or through prolonging that war indefinitely. When Iraq emerged from the war militarily victorious, the Zionist media were outraged and the Zionists began to warn against the danger of Iraq. Then, U.S. and British politicians in particular joined the Zionists in this policy to frighten the amirs of the oil states against the new Iraq, to discourage these amirs from cooperating with Iraq economically, and to turn all the aid extended to Iraq under certain circumstances into a financial burden on Iraq and weaken it economically. Then, Kuwait was assigned the task of plotting in the field of economy against Iraq in the first place, and then in the field of oil prices, aided in that by the United Arab Emirates. We do not know whether the UAE shares the same intentions, or whether its actions were based on its own judgment about oil prices.

However, we know that the amirs of Kuwait were trying to subvert the entire Iraqi economy, not only in causing a fluctuation in the oil prices in a manner that prevents Iraq from stabilizing its budget, but also in destroying the economy through commercial activities and currency speculation.

[Jackson] But Mr. President, I understand that until 2 August your demands concentrated on fair oil prices, Iraq's right to access to the sea, having the two uninhabited islands, and forgiving Iraq's debts. Have not these been your demands until 2 August?

[Hussein] These are some of our demands. However, what is more dangerous is Kuwait's conspiratorial role. Whenever I say Kuwait I mean the past regime of Croesus. We made everything clear at the Baghdad Summit in front of all the kings and heads of state who attended the Summit. We clarified the plotting and Jabir al-Ahmad was present. We said that that was considered a war against Iraq. We in Iraq consider it a war, and if you do not mean to launch a war against us you should change this policy, or we will consider it a war and will confront it as such.

Yes, before we discovered that plotting went that far, our demands were confined to part of our rights. Evidently, our rights historically, include the whole of Kuwait. However, before discovering the plotting of the past regime in Kuwait our demands were confined to only a part of our rights, and not all of our rights which include the islands, an enclave of territory and access to the sea and other matters which have been mentioned, as we thought that we could make them brothers who could take part with us in the general policy through brotherly behavior. Then, the pressure against us would have eased.

[Jackson] But Mr. President it seems that your Arab, UN, and world allies and neighbors used to support you in your demands, but your allies and others stood against you in the issue of the annexation of Kuwait. This has brought matters to the verge of a world war?

[Hussein] I have talked briefly to you about the facts tonight. We understand their failure to support the annexation of a state that used to exist in their daily dealings, but we ask them to understand the background so as to know in accordance with what assessments and calculations this so-called state has now become part of Iraq. The period in which it used to exist as a state was on land stolen from our ancestors, originally. During the period it was stolen from its origin, it was possible to deal with it, if it dealt with the origin in a constructive manner. However, it is not possible for the origin to accept that a part of it turns into a tool that harms the origin.

[Jackson] Mr. President, certainly you are against annexation through war. If there is an Arab solution through the Arab League and the United Nations that contains a fair resolution with regard to oil prices and Iraq's access to the sea--that is, fair prices and fair borders--will you accept the Arab solution, agree to return to the previous border, and accept Kuwait as an independent state if this guarantees world peace and justice?

[Hussein] Where does justice lie? In other words, can you show us a criterion for justice that we will know and adopt? Can anybody guide us to one unified criterion in similar situations so that we can go to it and adopt it?

[Jackson] Mr. President, there are general principles that support laws. For this, you recognized Kuwait as the Arab League and the United Nations did.

[Hussein] I was expecting this answer. We agree on this, and we do not have any objection to the importance of respecting human rights, the international law, and countries' rights. But, let us see how this international law, human rights, the resolutions of the Security Council and the United Nations are dealt with.

Aren't the Palestinians a people? The answer is yes, they are a nation. Let us put aside all historical backgrounds, not to ignore them, but to keep them outside the discussion. The first UN resolution on Palestine was adopted in Cyprus in 1947. Did the United States come with its fleets to undertake a military or economic action that reaches the extent of depriving Iraqi children of milk? This means that there is not one iota of consideration to humanity on the side of the U.S. Administration. When the Iraqi people starve, when the sick person in Iraq does not find medicine, and when the baby does not find milk, it is as if they are striking Iraq with nuclear bombs. This is inhumane behavior on the part of the United States. Are these not among the taboos in the international law, Mr. Jackson? The United States has committed this despite the fact that Iraq has not taken an American state. Meanwhile, we were forced to act because Kuwait is part of Iraq. And America or Zionism instigated this part to assume a destructive role against Iraq.

Let us take another example. Did America not occupy Grenade? Why did it not remember the international law, countries' rights, and human rights? In Palestine, there are civilized, effective, and capable people who can render humanity a more developed service than the family which ruled Kuwait until 2 August.

Who respects these criteria? Did the United States not remember that we and the Iranians occupied the territories of each other throughout the eight-year war? Why did it not come with its fleets, its armies, and the armies of others to stand between the two armies and stop the bloodshed? Therefore, the international law and human rights from the American viewpoint are covers it uses to peddle its own objectives. The time has come for Iraq to say to the United States: There is no more time for charlatanism. You should respect human rights and the rights of all people regardless of their color, nationality, religion, and name. This is the role undertaken by Iraq; it is a big honor. We will not become miserable regardless of the results as long as we are right.

[Jackson] Mr. President, you mentioned examples of the worst actions in history such as the U.S. invasion of Grenada and Panama and the Israeli occupation of the West Bank, the other Arab territories, and Lebanon. Yet there are other examples: like the use of gases against the Kurds, and the execution of the spy Bazoft. All these are wrong actions. The question is whether you are ready to correct the wrongs of history if you can?

[Hussein] We will be very happy if we find someone who will respond to us in correcting any wrong that has befallen mankind in general, and specifically the wrongs that have befallen our region and nation which have been unjustly treated by the United States, Zionism, and the United Kingdom. We are ready to correct things with international participation. However, this should be carried out in accordance with uniform yardsticks and all basic issues should be solved. First, the injustice that has befallen Palestine and the people of Palestine should be removed, the invaders who have despoiled our holy lands in Najd and Hejaz should go back to their countries, and we will accept with an open mind any dialogue, amendment, or correction in any point proposed in the 12 August initiative.

If some will say that these issues are so broad as to make it nearly impossible to tackle them as one issue, although we do not believe that such a claim is legitimate, then we can address the issues within an Arab framework. The Arabs can better understand the background of the things we have mentioned and they are capable of attaining a solution that will ease the crisis or settle it.

A five-sided summit meeting was scheduled among Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Yemen and we all agreed to this meeting. But we were surprised by the U.S. forces landing in Najd and Hejaz. Therefore, the United States is the one which has obstructed the chances of an Arab solution.

[Jackson] Land in exchange for peace. Since you are in the midst of the equation of Iraq, Kuwait, and Saudi Arabia, are you ready to carry this out, that is exchange land for peace?

[Hussein] What has Saudi Arabia got to do with this? Saudi Arabia is not a party. It merely became a cover for the U.S. forces under the pretext that it is afraid of Iraq, that the Iraqi army might occupy Saudi Arabia. This is big lie. Saudi Arabia has never been part of Iraq and Iraq has never been part of Saudi Arabia. Each of them has always been an independent country with known borders.

[Jackson] But the United States came at the invitation of Saudi Arabia?

[Hussein] Let us discuss this matter to see whether this is true or just a lie to cover up for the real intentions. First of all, there is an agreement of non-aggression and non-interference in domestic affairs between Iraq and Saudi Arabia. This did not exist between us and the previous Kuwaiti Government although we had proposed such a thing to the Kuwaiti Government which rejected it. We thank God that it had rejected this. Had there been such an agreement we would not have been able to use our army in any way whatsoever, and then we would lose our credibility.

Second, the Iraqi Army a few days later took up defensive positions and the U.S. satellites can show whether the Iraqi army was preparing for attack or on the defensive. Also, do you believe that the United States could have mobilized all these forces as quickly as this had this not been prepared beforehand? Then, there is the element which even the United States cannot refute. You were in the United States and you remember when they came to the region they said that we have come at Saudi Arabia's request to protect it from the Iraqi danger. This was announced by several senior officials. But when the lie was exposed, they started mentioning other objectives for the U.S. forces presence. This means that the U.S. Administration has decided to keep the U.S. armies as armies of occupation of Saudi Arabia, irrespective of what Saudi rulers want, or even if the Saudi rulers say in future: We have found out that Iraq has no designs against our territory and you must leave our country. They will not succeed in making the U.S. armies leave their country.

[Jackson] Mr. President, some people believe you had preconceived ideas to enter Kuwait. You also said the United States had preconceived ideas and plans to enter Saudi Arabia. If you withdrew to the previous border and achieved economic justice, you would thus challenge the United States. The Saudis had invited the United States and its forces because of the fear they felt.

[Hussein] Instead of twisting matters this way, let us see the things which will reassure Saudi Arabia that we will not attack its territory. We are prepared for an Arab dialogue or a bilateral dialogue to offer Saudi Arabia whatever will reassure it that we do not wish to take a single inch of its territory. Besides, talking about these things is nonsensical. This has never occurred to us and it is inconsistent with reality. Kuwait is part of Iraq. But, as we have already said, Saudi Arabia has never been part of Iraq, and Iraq has never been part of Saudi Arabia.

The two initiatives I presented to the world contained strong points which included specific proposals guaranteeing the stability of Saudi Arabia. However, the United States rejected them because it does not want Saudi Arabia to be stable.

[Jackson] Mr. President, if you accepted the Arab solution which guarantees exchanging or giving land for peace, this would serve as a guarantee for Saudi Arabia and would reassure the Saudis. Are you prepared to present the working paper you presented before 2 August which includes the achievement of economic justice? Would you accept the exchange of land for peace?

[Hussein] When matters are left to the Arabs, they will be able to achieve a solution serving their national and pan-Arab interests. However, if Arab affairs are left to the United States and those riding its bandwagon, the Arabs will not achieve any results. This is because all the other Arab issues which were left to the United States in

the past by those people who said the United States holds the key to any solution, remained unresolved. In fact, the situation has worsened with time.

[Jackson] Didn't you accept assistance from the United States and the Soviet Union during the Iraq-Iran war?

[Hussein] We asked them to stop the war. We are still ready to accept any assistance if offered to us honorably. However, the U.S. behavior now is hardly honorable, because it is aggressive behavior. How can we deal with the government of an army which occupies our holy places? Had the U.S. Government confined itself to expressing its stand regardless of what it was rather than embarking on such an aggression against our holy places and Iraq the situation would have been different.

[Jackson] Mr. President, it seems that if you accepted the Arab solution which includes the exchange of land for peace and if you adhered to the demands concerning economic justice and the border, you would spare the world a long, sanguinary war?

[Hussein] It is essential for any proposal made to be fair. If war breaks out, we will not be the party starting it. Those responsible for it will be the United States and Zionism and also Husni Mubarak and Fahd in the area. As for Iraq, it will be the party compelled to defend the honor of the Arab and Islamic nation and Iraq's sovereignty. Whoever thinks that Iraq will be alone in this battle is mistaken.

If I were a 30-year-old youth outside government authority as most of the youths who are now on the front, I would have wished for war to take place now rather than tomorrow, so the Arabs from the ocean to the gulf could honorably and firmly express their legitimate rights against this evil and arrogant hostility by Zionism and the United States. These are the feelings of all Arab youths now. However, I, as an official who is humanely responsible for the flow of any blood, whether it is the blood of an American or an Arab, regardless of his religion, because God is One, must work for peace. Thus you see that we are presenting one initiative after another. But the others are standing still and not making a single move.

[Jackson] Mr. President, before going through the issue of who is ready to die with honor, this is the road of war and fear. I believe that if war breaks out, the blood of our sons will flow, the oil will be burned, and many governments will be shaken. Is there a compromise between withdrawal and the annexation of Kuwait?

[Hussein] When there is a sincere intention for a comprehensive solution on the international level and with unified human criteria there will be a solution. And if things are left for the Arabs inasmuch as they are concerned, they will also find a solution.

[Jackson] Mr. President, my last question or questions are points that I would like to discuss or ease pressure on, such as the issue of those held here in Iraq against their will, What is the major step to release the hostages, and what is the step you will adopt to release the hostages kept here against their will? Do you have any thoughts on the possibility of adopting anything in this direction during the coming 24 or 48 hours?

[Hussein] We have explained this matter in more than one interview with more than one journalist. We have nothing to say about the coming 48 hours except that God's mercy is always big and it is always above the will of man.

[Jackson] Mr. President, you announced a plan or an initiative to release the children, women, and ill, Is there a place and specific plan to release those--a way to gather them and prepare them for departure?

[Hussein] I answered this question. I said we have done what we have done; we have nothing to say about the coming 48 hours.

[Jackson] Mr. President, are you ready to ease the tension by ending the measures which look like punishments imposed on the U.S. Embassy in Kuwait and Iraq. We noticed today in Kuwait and Baghdad that the officials in these two embassies cannot contact the American citizens here. Are you ready to give support to the officials in the two embassies to enable them assume their tasks in the appropriate way?

[Hussein] First, the talk about something called an embassy in Kuwait has ended since a decision on this was issued. The United States should have respected Iraq's decision because it represents the will of the people of Iraq who announced that the Governorate of Kuwait is an Iraqi governorate. It is supposed that there is no need for embassies to remain there.

[Jackson] But even the embassy in Baghdad could not render any services to the American citizens?

[Hussein] But, what kind of citizens do you mean?

[Jackson] The American citizens in Baghdad and Kuwait cannot contact their embassy?

[Hussein] You mean the hosted citizens. Yes, they cannot because these are our instructions. We are now in circumstances where the American fleets are around us and America is plotting aggression, and evil. And we, of course, mean the U.S. Administration, not the American people. Contact with the embassy now will harm the American citizens through silly instructions which the embassy receives from the U.S. government to oppose any decision Iraq adopts in accordance with its rights of sovereignty.

Therefore, we are living an abnormal situation in terms of relations and measures. And as you see, America expelled 36 Iraqi employees together with their families; it warned them to leave the United States within 72 hours. In France, they are detaining a number of Iraqis and have prohibited them from travel. Do you see

those who speak about democracy what they are doing? We did not dispatch fleets to France, and even so, France made a decision to detain ordinary Iraqi citizens.

[Jackson] Mr. President, with all due respect and in spite of what has happened to the embassies and the removal of diplomats, the Iraqi ambassador in Washington is being respected and can meet the press and explain your viewpoint there. I believe that this frank dialogue is to try to make us carry out dialogue and diplomatic moves. We hope that this course will overpower the course of war and that negotiations will have the upper hand. We believe that the people of this world deserve to live in peace and that you can contribute to this. Thank you very much.

[Hussein] The U.S. Charge d'Affaires can ask to meet any person and to hold a dialogue with this or that person. He can also ask to meet Iraqi journalists to explain his viewpoint to them. But this has not taken place. Do you know why? Because the U.S. Administration has no respect for the Iraqi individual and believes he does not deserve to be given any attention to the point that it does not believe it is necessary to have the Charge d'Affaires meet with the Iraqi press to explain to it the U.S. viewpoint. As for us, we respect the opinion of the U.S. citizen. That's why I have received all the U.S. journalists who arrived in Iraq. You notice that we have spent two nights with you although we need every hour and every minute to follow up our daily economic, military, and political affairs. Although you mentioned that this interview will last only one hour, we see that two hours and fifteen minutes have passed already. I am not worried by this because I respect you as a human being. The only consideration that makes me meet with you is not because you occupy this or that position, or for any other consideration. The only consideration is that we are both human beings. If an Iraqi official who enjoys the same status as you do goes to the United States, do you think he will succeed in meeting with Mr. Bush as easily as you have done with me? I really doubt this. I also doubt that Mr. Bush would even deal with heads of states who visit him the same way as we have treated you.

[Jackson] Mr. President, I am not responsible for the U.S. President's actions. However, I still believe communication channels should remain open between us so as to give peace a chance.

[Hussein] From our side, all channels are open for any dialogue.

[Jackson] This is the best course.

[Hussein] Yes, this is the soundest course for the establishment of cordial relations among people. With this course, and without resorting to the use of force, or to empty arrogance, one can avoid wars and place humankind on the course of lasting and comprehensive peace.

[Jackson] Thank you.

[Hussein] This is a good opportunity for a humanitarian dialogue. There are U.S. citizens who are reported to be sick. We shall not seek the advice of our physicians on this but shall take the word of the U.S. citizens whom we are still hosting against their will. In honor of Mr. Jackson, the human being, in honor of every honest American in the eyes of all the Arabs and Islam, and out of respect for the legitimate interests of the people, we will allow four of those whom we are hosting to leave with you on the plane that is taking you back to the United States.

[Jackson] Allow me to thank you. We have already spoken of the women and children.

[Hussein] It has been decided that the the women and children will leave for their countries. Do you want to take them with you?

[Jackson] Yes.

[Hussein] Take them with you on board the Iraqi plane. This is the group of women and children we decided to allow to travel. Take also the four sick men. The plane will be an Iraqi plane. It will carry you at our expense to Amman and from there to the destinations you wish and finally to Washington. This is to please you and not to please Bush because I do not care to please Bush.

[Jackson] Does this mean the women who are in Kuwait?

[Hussein] I have replied to you by saying that they are the women whom we decided to allow to travel and who were here with us, held by us, or were our guests against their will. You will take them with you on the plane, as well as the four sick men, not to mention a bouquet of flowers. You will take them and leave.

[Jackson] Thank you.

[Hussein] Goodbye.

Interview with Dr. Sa'dun Hammadi, Deputy Prime Minister and Revolution Command Council member, by an unidentified radio and television reporter, September 1990

[Reporter] Ladies and gentlemen: We are happy to have with us Dr. Sa'dun Hammadi, member of the Revolution Command Council, and Deputy Prime Minister. Welcome.

[Hammadi] Thank you.

[Reporter] What is the economic significance of unity between Kuwait and Iraq, in your opinion?

[Hammadi] I am glad that public opinion is being given the opportunity to view the economic aspect of the important political event--namely, the unity of Iraq's southern part with us. It is an important side that ought to be explored for the benefit of Iraqi and Arab public opinion, in the first instance. Of course, the economic side is extensive and multifaceted. Iraq is a key oil producer. Iraq's known oil reserves before unity were 100 billion barrels, comprising 10 percent of world reserves. The known reserves in the governorate of Kuwait are currently 94.5 billion barrels. Consequently, the new united Iraq's oil reserves amount to 194 billion barrels, equivalent to approximately 20 percent of the world reserves of 1,001.1 billion barrels.

I would like to point out, though, that Iraq's known reserves of 100 billion barrels before unity is not final. Iraq is a vast country, and the potential for oil discoveries remains immense. The survey of Iraq is not yet final to allow for an exact figure on Iraq's reserves. After the July 1968 Revolution and Law No. 80, Iraq was subjected to an oil embargo by multinational oil companies. And so Iraq remained without a detailed survey for a long time. I therefore expect that Iraq's oil reserves will exceed this figure. It is therefore not ruled out that Iraq's reserves will exceed 20 percent of total world reserves, and consequently be at the top of the league of oil producers. Of course, we are not producing at full capacity, but according to Iraq's quota set by OPEC. Prior to unity with Kuwait, Iraq's quota was, as is known, 3.1 million barrels per day (BPD). The quota of the Governorate of Kuwait is 1.5 million BPD as fixed by OPEC, but not adhered to by the former rulers of Kuwait, who produced in excess of 2 million BPD. New Iraq is, of course, a charter OPEC member and has consistently and faithfully abided by OPEC resolutions. Therefore, there is no question of new Iraq following the same pattern of behavior as the former Kuwait Government. Iraq will stick to its OPEC quota, which, after unification, is 4.6 million BPD.

Of course, public opinion in Iraq and among the Arab masses probably wants to know what Iraq's returns will be, because economic significance is attached to the returns of the hard currency which the country possesses. Iraq's returns, if estimated in view of its current quota, which is 4.6 billion BPD, and at the minimum price, which is now \$25 per barrel, will amount to \$38.3 billion annually. If we estimate the price, however, not at \$25, because after a while it will go higher to reach \$30 per barrel of the current production, the returns will amount to about \$46 billion annually.

Iraq, however, does not only emphasize a rise in prices, but also believes that production should increase in a logical and gradual manner, so that it will be in harmony with the increasing demand for oil in the world. Iraq has been known for its moderate oil policy, which believes that prices and production should go higher in a gradual, logical manner that ensures the interests of the producing countries on the one hand; that is, maintaining the purchasing power of the barrel, and at the same time not causing temporary crises in the economies of the world and the underdeveloped countries.

So, if these changes occur, if the production quota of the new Iraq rises from 4.6 to 5 million barrels at a price of \$25, the returns of Iraq will amount to \$45.6 billion annually. Hence, 5 million barrels at \$30 each means that returns will total \$54.8 billion annually. However, if we imagine that Iraq's quota will increase on the long run to more than that--say, for example, 5.5 million barrels, the returns, at the price of \$25 per barrel will amount to \$50.2 billion annually, and at the price of \$30 per barrel will amount to \$60.2 billion annually.

This is the view about the financial and economic impact of the unification of the southern part of Iraq with the mother homeland, as regards the oil returns. However, the topic has other aspects. Here, I should not forget to talk about Iraq's coast. Before unity, Iraq was almost considered one of the landlocked countries, though it was not completely landlocked. The length of the Iraqi coast before unity, for example, was about 60 kilometers. It is not only that the distance is short, but access to the Iraqi coasts was through narrow waterways that could easily be blocked in times of emergency. This means that Iraq's contact with the outside world through its coasts used to be through a narrow waterway which was subject to closure for hostile reasons during wartime or disasters. So, Iraq, in fact, was one of the countries that was semi-landlocked. Following the unification of Iraq, the length of the Iraqi coast has become 362 kilometers. In addition, the long coast has freed Iraq from this stifling situation. Thus, Iraq's lack of wide coasts, the element of threat--that is, having to cross through narrow waterways subject to blockade, was eliminated and access to and from Iraq has changed. This, of course, has clear military and economic implications.

Therefore, the capacity of Iraqi ports has improved at present. Before the unification between Iraq and Kuwait, Iraqi port capacity was not designed to handle more than 16 million tonnes. The actual volume of goods handed by these ports was lower than this figure. But after the unification between Iraq and Kuwait, there is an

additional port capacity to handle almost 10 million tonnes of goods. Thus, the capacity of ports in new Iraq has become 26.5 million tonnes which can be handled through the import and export services. This, of course, ends a disturbing bottleneck and suits the phase of massive development awaiting Iraq after unification of the southern part with the motherland.

[Reporter] Doctor, these maps show it.

[Hammadi] Yes, the maps show the Iraqi shores before and after unification. They show how the Iraqi shoreline has expanded, how Iraq has secured access to the sea, and how export outlets have grown. As regards oil, Iraqi export capacity is different right now. Before Iraq's unification with Kuwait, Iraq had an oil exporting capacity totaling 4.3 million BPD. This means that had Iraq's OPEC quota increased and reached 5 million BPD, Iraq would have had to establish new export outlets and to spend funds on this. Now that the southern part of Iraq has been unified with the homeland, the oil export capacity has risen to 7.3 million BPD. This means that if Iraq's OPEC quota were to increase and reach 5 million BPD or to 5.5 million BPD, Iraq would not have to establish new export outlets, or new ports for exporting oil. Of course, there are three new ports: the 'Abdallah port, the al-Shu'aybah, and the al-Nida' [al-Ahmadi] port in the Governorate of Kuwait right now. Consequently, Iraqi oil exporting capacity has become extensive. It can handle more than its current OPEC production quota or even any possible increase in its quota in the foreseeable future. As we have said, this quota might increase and become 5 million or 5.5 million BPD. Iraq has the capacity to export 7.3 million BPD.

There is another aspect that has to be brought up. Industrial installations, mostly from the private sector, have recently emerged in the southern part of Iraq. Statistics show that the Governorate of Kuwait has 883 industrial installations. These installations have added an industrial production capacity to Iraq's industrial capacity prior to unification. Figures show that there are in the Governorate of al-Basrah, for example, 81 industrial installations specializing in food and beverage, 24 specializing in textile and clothing, three leather industries, 87 installations specializing in timber and furniture, 65 specializing in paper, 114 specializing in chemicals, 223 specializing in mining, eight specializing in minerals, 225 specializing in metal products, 14 specializing in the manufacture of nonelectrical equipment, 16 specializing in the manufacture of electrical appliances, 13 specializing in the manufacture of transport equipment, and 10 specializing in numerous intermediate products. The grand total is 883 installations. Thus, the private sector in new Iraq has expanded. Integration and interaction among these installations, the socialist sector, the mixed sector, and the private sector existing in Iraq before unification will take place. Consequently, Iraqi industrial capacity has expanded and become more effective and active than it was in the past. These are the economic aspects which I can review in brief as one of the effects resulting from the unification of the southern part of Iraq with the homeland.

[Reporter] How do you think this will affect Iraq's development?

[Hammadi] Before dealing with this, I must give some information on the previous development plans. This information indicates that the investment budget for 1980, which is one of the highest, was \$11.6 billion. This means that we invested \$11.6 billion. The actual investment average from 1981 to 1989 was about \$13.3 billion.

In answering the first question, I mentioned that the minimum amount of revenues based on new Iraq's quota--that is, Iraq's quota plus the Kuwait Governorate's quota, at a price of \$25--will be 38.3 billion. This revenue could reach \$60.2 billion if we produce million BPD at \$30 per barrel; Iraqi revenues would be \$60.2 billion.

Therefore, I expect that on the basis of these new revenues, Iraq's annual development plan will be between \$10 and \$30 billion at a minimum. This means that if these figures are realized, the annual investments in development will be between \$10 and \$30 billion.

In addition, there is the debts issue. I expect that we will be able to repay all of our debts within two, four, or five years at the most. This will be done directly and without periods of grace or postponement as we have done in the past. Therefore, Iraq will obviously be able to repay its debts in two to four years and invest in development between \$10 and \$30 billion. The remainder will be expended on imports and Iraq's defense and other needs. This means that we will place our economy on a sound, healthy basis and the wheel of development will start moving again.

[Reporter] Can you give us an idea about Arab development efforts and new Iraq's role in the Arab countries' development?

[Hammadi] For a very long time, Iraq has been at the forefront of those calling and working for promoting Arab development. Iraq upholds the motto that oil wealth belongs to all Arabs and that there should be a balanced distribution in using this wealth for development in Arab countries. This means that countries that have a surplus of oil revenues must seriously assist countries that are short of hard currency and those that need capital for development. However, this last period of development has regrettably been less than Arab aspirations and much below the required level.

For instance, total loans from Arab funding to all Arab countries since the establishment of the Arab Fund 10 years ago, did not exceed \$6.6 billion.

If we take the needs of Arab states and their populations, particularly those of needy countries like Sudan and other Arab states into account, we would find that the resources earmarked for assistance by the oil states through their fund have been very meager. You are well aware that Iraq made persistent and immense efforts to secure the convening of an economic summit. This summit was held in November 1980.

After immense and persistent efforts, Iraq managed to make the oil-producing Arab countries approve what was known at the time as the development decade document. The development decade document provides for the allocation of \$500 million per year by all oil producing Arab states over a 10-year period; that is, \$5 billion over a 10-year period, to aid all other Arab states. Regrettably, this agreement which calls for the collection of this meager amount of \$500 million per year from all oil-producing states was not implemented due to Iraq's preoccupation with the war. Meetings to discuss the issue followed one another. Procrastination and prevarication prevailed during these meetings. This continued until the development decade ended with a resolution forced by the Gulf states which called for increasing the capital in the existing funds, rather than renewing the development decade's term. That was the end of the issue. As for the capital for these funds, it was not increased. Nothing happened. The situation remained unchanged.

I will try and work through the revolutionary government in Iraq to renew the Arab development decade agreement. I will also work for a serious fund to which oil-producing Arab states will be asked to contribute to effect real development in Arab states. I propose and believe that this fund should have a capital of \$50 billion over a 10-year period. That is, \$5 billion should be contributed per year, instead of \$5 billion over a 10-year period which was reflected in the previous summit resolution. I expect that Iraq will be a major contributor to this new fund, which will have a capital of \$50 billion to be contributed over a 10-year period to aid the other Arab states that need resources and hard currency for development.

I also believe that the procedures to obtain loans should be simplified and that the harsh conditions set by some Arab funds should be eased. These funds set strict conditions similar to those imposed by the IMF. They are conditions and using procedures that are difficult setting for Arab states. This reduces the benefits that can be drawn from these funds due to these conditions and procedures. Moreover, I believe that these conditions should be relaxed. I also believe that the conditions should be eased so that needy Arab states can actually benefit from the new development decade. I would like to reiterate that the capital of this new decade should be \$50 billion over a 10-year period; that is, \$5 billion per year to be contributed by the oil-producing countries to other needy Arabs.

THE KUWAIT QUESTION

Letter Addressed by H.E. Tariq Aziz

Baghdad, 4 September 1990

Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of The Republic of Iraq

To The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of all countries in the world

Foreword

On 4 September 1990, Mr. Tariq Aziz, Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of the Republic of Iraq, addressed a letter to the Foreign Ministers of the Arab World and of the World at large. The letter offers a documented presentation of historical facts and evidence about Kuwait, its historical, geographical and human ties with Iraq, and of the role played by British imperialism in severing this part from Iraq and turning it into an artificial entity, under British hegemony, in order to deprive Iraq from its natural and historical access to the waters of Arab Gulf.

In its second part, the letter describes the conspiratorial role played against Iraq by the former rulers of Kuwait at the instigation of the United States and its allies.

The letter also reviews the events preceding the 2nd of August 1990, and the developments ensuing until the 4th of September, the date on which it was signed.

Your Excellency . . . Greetings,

Amidst the developments witnessed in the Arab Gulf region, I find it necessary and useful to present some of the facts which I believe will help you understand the background to the events that have occurred in this region.

Iraq, is known to have always been a political entity and the seat of many states throughout millennia. It has always been a coastal state and a major trading center. The small village established some two centuries ago on the banks of the Arab Gulf under the name of "Kuwait", an Iraqi term for "a small settlement of people," had

remained throughout the nineteenth century and up to the First World War, an Iraqi Qadhaa' (district) belonging to the province of Basrah. Under Ottoman administrative law, Kuwait was an integral part of Iraq, subject to the Province of Basrah.

In 1897, the governor of Basrah, Muhsin Pasha, informed the Sheikh of Kuwait, Mubarak al-Sabah, of the Sultan's decree appointing him as Qa'im-Maqam (district administrator) of the Qadhaa' of Kuwait, a district of the Province of Basrah. By then, Mubarak had been instigated by the British to kill his two elder brothers, Mohammed and Jarrah, who had opposed the British plan to turn Kuwait into an entity under British dominance.

In 1899, Britain goaded Mubarak al-Sabah into signing a secret agreement under which the British were to provide him with protection even though he was a vassal of the Ottoman Empire and, accordingly, had no authority to sign any international accord. The agreement was therefore strongly rejected by the Ottoman Sultan, which forced Mubarak to retreat and declare his allegiance and subordination to the Ottoman Sublime Porte in 1901.

Britain never ceased these attempts, but continued to establish bases in various parts of the Arab Gulf in order to consolidate its colonial grip over this region, the strategic importance of which had increased both militarily and politically, within the framework of the competition with the Ottoman Empire, and economically as it constituted an important trade route and was known by the British to contain vast oil reserves. In order to secure the interests of the British Empire by weakening all major states in the region, Britain focused its influence on Kuwait and drew artificial boundaries as they did later, together with their French ally, in the Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1917. By so doing Britain perniciously severed a part of Iraq in a manner that deprived a country ancient in its civilization, and great in its land and population, of its natural access to the waters of the Arab Gulf, the access which it had possessed throughout history.

It was through such artificial colonial means that an artificial entity, called Kuwait, was first created under British domination and given artificial boundaries which have no historical or geographical foundations.

Since its establishment in 1921, the State of Iraq has refused to accept this artificial entity. All successive Iraqi governments continued to demand the return of this severed part of Iraq and historical and geographical justice be done to Iraq to guarantee its commercial and economic interests and provide it with the requirements necessary for the defence of its national security. This was the position adopted by successive Iraqi governments, despite the fact that the Iraqi regime at the time was closely linked to Britain.

Britain had also vigorously opposed any project which would bring the one people of Iraq and Kuwait close together or to maintain continuous contacts with each other. The project to supply Kuwait with water from Shatt al-Arab, to lay a railway to Kuwait, and to establish an Iraqi port in Kuwait City were all rejected. These projects continued to encounter British procrastination and/or outright rejection throughout the period from the early 1920s to the early 1960s.

Then Britain consistently exerted pressure on Iraq to accept the fait accompli. When the British government forced the Prime Minister of Iraq in 1932 to exchange letters with the British Commissioner in Baghdad, regarding the demarcation of the boundaries on the basis of the draft agreement proposed between the Ottoman and British governments which had remained unsigned because of the outbreak of the World War I, the Iraqi House of Representatives refused, in its capacity as the country's legislative authority, to ratify the said letters.

During the 1930s, popular demand increased for the return of Kuwait to Iraq. The national press adopted those demands and began supporting them with articles and historical documents affirming the inevitable return of Kuwait to Iraq. Yet in 1933, in his letters to the resident British Political Commissioner in the Gulf, the British Political Agent in Kuwait, Colonel Dixon, warned against any rapprochement between the people in Kuwait and Iraq, and called for their separation.

In 1940, the ruler of Kuwait replaced the Iraqi administration of the post office in Kuwait with British staff. In 1945, the Iraqi school curricula applied in Kuwaiti schools were replaced by Egyptian curricula.

King Ghazi, the second monarch of Iraq, supported enthusiastically the necessity of the unification of Kuwait with Iraq. He expressed his desire to visit Kuwait in return to an earlier visit made to Iraq by Sheikh Ahmed al-Sabah in 1932. Britain, however, did not encourage the visit, and endeavored to prevent Iraq and Kuwait from reaching any agreement.

In April 1938, the then Foreign Minister of Iraq, Mr. Tawfiq al-Suwaidi, informed the British ambassador in Baghdad, Mr. Peterson, that the Anglo-Ottoman Agreement of 1913 had recognized Kuwait as a district belonging to the province of Basrah, and since sovereignty over Basrah had been transferred from the Ottomans to the state of Iraq, then that sovereignty should include Kuwait as provided for in the agreement of 1913. Iraq, therefore, does not recognize any change in the status of Kuwait.

The Iraqi popular demand for the return of Kuwait to Iraq was met with wide favorable response from the population in Kuwait. Kuwaiti youth took an active part in the call for Kuwaiti unification with Iraq. In May 1938, a group of "free Kuwaitis" submitted a petition to the Iraqi Government inviting Iraq to help them achieve their aspirations regarding the return of Kuwait to Iraq. To this end, a "national coalition" as established to call

upon Ahmed al-Sabah, the Sheikh of Kuwait to set up a legislative council representing the free people of Kuwait. He was forced to agree to this demand. During the first session of the new Council, the members expressed their demand for the return of Kuwait to Iraq. The Council's demand displeased the ruler of Kuwait and he dissolved the Council on 21 December 1938, and waged a campaign of arrest and oppression against its members.

Nevertheless, the free people of Kuwait continued to demand the return of Kuwait to Iraq. They sent many telegrams to petition King Ghazi, one of those telegrams, which was broadcast on Baghdad radio on 7 March 1939, called upon King Ghazi to intervene, saying:

"Our history confirms the integration of Kuwait with Iraq. We shall live and die under the Iraqi flag. Ghazi! help your brothers in Kuwait!"

The situation escalated into a sweeping uprising led by the youth of Kuwait against the authorities on 10 March 1939. The ruler of Kuwait had to resort to armed force to disperse the youth, a great number of whom he then arrested and imprisoned.

King Ghazi tried to intervene to secure the release of the prisoners. He warned the Sheikh of Kuwait against the continued harassment of the "free Kuwaitis." In consequence, King Ghazi and the then Iraqi Government were subjected to intense British pressure to cease making Iraqi demands for the integration of Kuwait. To this end, the British ambassador in Baghdad, Mr. Peterson, had several secret meetings with King Ghazi shortly before the latter's death, in an attempt to press him to give up the claims to Kuwait. King Ghazi was killed in a mysterious accident on 5 April 1939, giving every reason to believe that Britain was actually behind his death because of his strong advocacy of the return of Kuwait to Iraq.

Following the assassination of King Ghazi, pro-British collaborators seized power in the country. With the outbreak of the Second World War and during the following years, Iraq and the region witnessed a series of successive changes and developments, including the creation of Israel, the Arab-Israeli war, and the revolution in Egypt. All these developments gave the British colonialists the pretext to concentrate their influence in Kuwait severing its political and human links with Iraq.

On 9 March 1956, while Sellwyn Llyod, the British Foreign Secretary, was on a visit to Baghdad attending a consultative meeting of the Permanent Council of the Baghdad Pact, Prime Minister Nouri al-Said of Iraq raised the subject of accession of Kuwait to the Arab Union which was being formed at the time. Llyod promised to put the matter before the British cabinet. Britain's reply, which was delivered via the British ambassador in Baghdad, Michael Wright, was that Britain was prepared to grant Kuwait independence, and Kuwait would have the freedom to decide the question of joining the Union. In order to present Britain with a fait accompli, Iraq dispatched Deputy Prime Minister, Tawfiq al-Suwaidi, in April 1957, to Shtura in Lebanon, where Sheikh Abdullah al-Salim al-Sabah was staying, in order to negotiate with him about the necessity of Kuwait's accession to the Union which was to be established. That effort, however, did not produce any positive result.

Early in 1958, Prime Minister Nouri al-Said of Iraq submitted to the Baghdad Pact the necessity of the integration of Kuwait with Iraq, at a meeting attended by the representatives of Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan along with the US Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, who attended the meeting as an observer.

No success was achieved at that meeting due to Britain's persistent objection. Following the establishment of the Arab Union between Iraq and Jordan on 14 February 1958, King Faisal II, joined by Prime Minister Nouri al-Said, and the Foreign Minister of the new Union, Tawfiq al-Suwaidi, raised the issue of unity with Kuwait with the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Sellwyn Llyod. The British, however, rejected the Iraqi position.

When Abdullah al-Salim al-Sabah, the Sheikh of Kuwait, visited Baghdad on 10 May 1958, King Faisal II and Prime Minister Nouri al-Said, raised with him the issue of Kuwait's entry to the Arab Union. The Sheikh of Kuwait responded by saying that he had to consult the British and seek their advice on the matter.

On 5 June 1958, the Government of the Union presented a confidential note to the British Embassy in Baghdad proposing the accession of Kuwait to the Arab Union. The note stated that:

... the land of Kuwait had, from the point of view of international law, been under the sovereignty of the Ottoman Empire, as a qadhaa' (district) belonging to the province of Basrah. This sovereignty had never been subject to doubt or dispute from the point of view of either the local authorities in Kuwait or the British Government. Indeed, the latter had recognized this fact in the Anglo-Turkish Agreement signed in London on 29 July 1913 which stated, in article 6, the right of the Sheikh of Kuwait to exercise his authority invested in him as an Ottoman district administrator subordinate to the Province of Basrah.

As a result of this, the Iraqi Government and the Government of the Arab Union became convinced that Britain was behind the obstacles preventing the achievement of this objective. This generated tension in Iraqi-British relations and led Iraq to intensify its efforts and increase its pressure upon Britain. An official note was prepared by the Iraqi Government to be published on 12 July 1958, with documented evidence regarding the issue of Kuwait's entry into the Arab Union. But the British ambassador requested that the publication of that note be postponed and informed Arab Union Foreign Minister Tawfiq al-Suwaidi of Britain's approval, in principle, of the

idea of Kuwait joining the Arab Union, provided that the details of the matter be discussed at a meeting which was set to be held in London, on 24 July 1958, between the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister of the Arab Union, on the one hand and their British counterparts on the other. The meeting, however, did not take place because of the Iraqi Revolution on 14 July 1958.

In 1961, Britain decided to grant the artificial entity of Kuwait what it called "independence," a decision which prompted the then Prime Minister of Iraq to declare, in a press conference on 25 June 1961, that Iraq considered Kuwait an integral part of its territory and that Iraq does not recognize the special relationship agreement between Britain and Kuwait which the Sheikh of Kuwait, Abdullah al-Salim al-Sabah, had signed with Colonel M.J. Meade, the resident British Politician in the Gulf, on 19 June 1961. Following that declaration, Britain deployed its armed forces in the area to confront Iraq and protect its new creation, the so-called "State of Kuwait."

Had it not been for the mistake made by Iraq's Foreign Minister at the time, Hashim Jawad, when he withdrew in angry protest from the meeting of the Arab League Council, which was considering the entry of the so-called "State of Kuwait" into the League of Arab States, thereby allowing a decision to be adopted, on 20 July 1961, to accept Kuwait as a member of the Arab League, this artificial entity would have remained outside the League; and hence out of the international organizations, as the admission of a new member to the League of Arab States is subject to a unanimous vote of approval.

The Iraqi Foreign Ministry issued statement on 21 July 1961, declaring that Iraq considered decision # 35-1777, accepting Kuwait as a member of the League of Arab States, to be a flagrant violation of the League's Charter which stipulated that such a decision could only be adopted by unanimity. Iraq also declared the said decision to be null and void and made clear its position that Kuwait would remain an integral part of its territory and that Iraq would not abandon its endeavors to restore this part by all legitimate means.

The Government of the former regime in Kuwait also failed in its efforts between 1961 and late 1963 to be granted membership in the United Nations.

Following the downfall of the political regime which ruled Iraq between July 1958 and February 1963, the Prime Minister of the former Government of Kuwait visited Baghdad in circumstances of political confusion and instability in Iraq. A joint communique was issued on the basis of the correspondence of 1932. However, the National Council of Revolutionary Command (NCRC), the highest Iraqi legislative authority according to the interim constitution of 1963, did not ratify that communique.

This historical review shows that none of the successive governments of Iraq has accepted the severance of the Kuwaiti part from the land of Iraq or signed a border treaty with the artificial entity created therein. No constitutional law has ever been promulgated to describe the border.

Such was the situation prevailing in Iraq by the time of the Revolution of 17-30 July 1968. The revolutionary government leading Iraq since that date has been keen, under instruction from President Saddam Hussein, to settle this issue in a manner that would secure for Iraq a reasonable measure of its historical rights and remove at least a limited part of the injustice done to it since the beginning of the century.

During the 1970s, Iraq was the party that took the initiative in approaching the former rulers of Kuwait to find such a settlement. But those rulers, encouraged by their foreign allies, insisted that Iraq accept the measures imposed by British colonialism. The Foreign Minister of Iraq visited Kuwait City on a number of occasions in 1972 and 1973 to discuss this issue. The Interior Minister, too, visited Kuwait for the same purpose on 16 May 1978. Several committees were formed without achieving any results.

This chapter on the discussions of this issue was put aside following the outbreak of the Iran-Iraq war. Immediately after the liberation of Faw, however, and while attending the Algiers Arab Summit, I took the initiative in informing the Foreign Minister of the former regime in Kuwait of our genuine desire to settle the border issue. We were astonished, when there was no prompt response from the regime and we had to wait until early July 1988 when the Foreign Minister of the former regime visited Iraq to agree that the subject be discussed by the two Foreign Ministers.

The talks between the two sides were delayed because of my preoccupation with the Iraq-Iran negotiations following the cease-fire. The President of Iraq decided to send the Vice-Chairman of the Revolution Command Council, Mr. Izzat Ibrahim to Kuwait City, on 6 December 1988, to urge the former regime there to resume the talks. It was agreed that our RCC Vice-Chairman would represent our side while the Crown Prince of the former regime would represent theirs.

The visit of Vice-Chairman, Ibrahim was returned by Sa'ad al-Abdullah on 6 February 1989, but it was clear that he was not prepared to consider even the minimum of Iraq's legitimate demands.

On 27 March 1989, Sa'ud al-Usaimi, the Minister of State for external affairs of the former regime, visited Baghdad and officially proposed that the talks on this issue be postponed. During the visit made by the Sheikh of Kuwait to Baghdad in September 1989, President Saddam Hussein proposed to him that the border talks be resumed. It was agreed that the matter be pursued between Deputy Prime Minister Sa'doun Hammadi and the

Foreign Minister of the former regime. Dr. Hammadi visited Kuwait City on 19 November 1989 to discuss the subject. The Foreign Minister of the former regime did not reciprocate the visit until February 1990.

It ought to be mentioned here that the former rulers of Kuwait had in fact exploited the Situation throughout the period during which the settlement of this issue remained pending. They exploited Iraq's internal and regional preoccupations, the last and most pressing of which being the Iran-Iraq war which lasted eight years. They expanded northwards, setting up police-posts, military installations, farms and oil rigs. In 1963, for instance, the check-point for crossing from Kuwait to Basrah was a place called al-Mitlaa' where passports were stamped. But during the time in which Iraq was preoccupied with internal and regional problems, this check-point was gradually moved up to a place more than seventy kilometers to the north of al-Mitlaa' to present Iraq with a fait accompli.

Dear colleague,

As to the political and economic aspects of the issue, I wish to point out the following:

In February 1990, President Saddam Hussein delivered a speech at the Amman Summit in which he warned against the continued presence of the US Navy in the Arab Gulf, now that the war between Iraq and Iran had come to an end. President Hussein stated that:

The continued US presence in the Gulf is due to the fact that the Gulf, in view of the developments witnessed in international politics and in the prospect of the oil market and of the increasing need for oil by the United States, Europe, Japan, and perhaps even the Soviet Union, has become the most important spot in the region. Indeed it may have become the most important spot in the whole world.

The country, therefore, that succeeds in wielding the biggest share of influence over the region, through the Arab Gulf and its oil, will secure to itself an unchallenged supremacy as a superpower. This means that, unless the people of the Gulf and all the Arabs are aware, the Gulf region will become subject to the will of the United States. The situation may get to the point where, if the debilitation and unawareness continue the United States will try to dictate the level of oil and gas production for each country, the amount sold to this or that country, and the price at which it is to be sold, all in accordance with the special interests of the United States and regardless of the interests of others.

Following the President's speech, a feverish campaign was launched against Iraq by US and other Zionist-influenced circles in the West. It soon became clear that those circles intended to corner Iraq politically and in the mass media in preparation for a military strike to be implemented by Israel to destroy Iraq's military power which those circles considered to have upset the strategic balance in the region, the balance that had previously been in Israel's favour.

The price of oil, at the time of the President's speech in Amman, was somewhere between \$18 and \$21 per barrel. Immediately afterwards, we saw the rulers of Kuwait, supported by those of the Emirates, suddenly announce their demand for an increase in their OPEC quotas. Before waiting for the matter to be discussed in OPEC, they proceeded to flood the oil market through overproduction, bringing about a sharp fall in prices and a rapid decline in Iraq's already debilitated revenues. The price of oil went down to \$11 per barrel, which meant a reduction of several billion dollars in Iraq's income, at a time when the country was encountering the very heavy economic burden left by the costs of the war.

Iraq sought to draw attention, by diplomatic means and through bilateral contacts, to the destructive consequences to its economy because of this policy. Iraq dispatched envoys to Kuwait, the Emirates, Saudi Arabia and other countries; but all was to no avail.

At the Baghdad Arab Summit Conference which was held over the period 28-30 May 1990, President Saddam Hussein, in the presence of all the leaders, warned against this policy during a closed session on 30 May 1990. The President said:

War occurs sometimes through soldiers and damage is inflicted by explosives, killings, or coup attempts. At others times war occurs through economic means. To those who do not intend to wage war against Iraq, I say that this is a kind of war against Iraq.

The behavior of the former rulers of Kuwait and of the Emirates, however, did not change. They continued to flood the market with oil and to destabilize the oil prices. Iraq again took the initiative, late in June 1990, in sending Deputy Prime Minister Sa'doun Hammadi to deliver letters from President Saddam Hussein to King Fahd, Jabir al-Ahmed and Sheikh Zayid.

Iraq proposed that a summit meeting be held amongst the four parties (Iraq, Saudi Arabia, the Emirates, and Kuwait), with a view to arriving at an acceptable settlement of the problem. King Fahd, however, and both the former ruler of Kuwait and the ruler of the Emirates, evaded such a meeting and accepted instead that the

meeting should be on the level of oil ministers. The four oil ministers met on 10 July 1990, and the Saudi, Kuwaiti and Emirate ministers pretended to accept a return to the level of production in agreed in OPEC quotas.

No sooner had the meeting ended than the oil minister of the former regime in Kuwait announced that his regime would again demand an increase in its share in October next. This was meant to sabotage the positive results of the meeting in order to continue the conspiracy to destroy the Iraqi economy. In his national address of 16 July 1990, President Saddam Hussein reiterated his warning against the new type of conspiracy being perpetrated against Iraq through certain Arab quarters. The President said:

Because the people of Iraq, who have suffered this deliberate injustice, have enough faith in their right to self-defence and the defence of their rights, they shall never forget the saying: "Rather heads be cut off, than sustenance." If words fail to provide protection, then decisive action must be taken to restore the usurped rights to their owners.

President Hussein pointed out in that same address that the loss incurred by Iraq, since the beginning of the slump in oil prices from \$28 to \$11 per barrel, had amounted to \$14 billion. All this was due to the policy of flooding the world market with cheap oil which in turn replenished the strategic reserves of the United States whose need for imported oil had already witnessed a marked increase in recent times. This policy caused huge damage to the national economy and was a treacherous stab in the back for Iraq.

For, although Iraq emerged victorious from a very long and costly war, it was burdened with huge debts which had to be repaid. Iraq had also to continue its development plans and provide food for its people who had endured much and sacrificed the flower of its youth in defending its national and pan-Arab security and in protecting the Gulf region from the advancing Iranian danger. Prior to that, His Excellency, the President had voiced a clear warning on 9 July 1990, when he received Mr. Hisham Nazir, the Saudi oil minister to whom the President said:

I shall not allow myself to accept for the people of Iraq to go hungry, and for the women of Iraq to go naked of need.

On 15 July 1990, I delivered a detailed note to the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States in Tunis, a note substantiated by facts and figures confirming the involvement of the former rulers of Kuwait in the conspiracy to destroy the economy of Iraq, and exposing their deliberate and incessant violations, over the years, of the rights and vital interests of Iraq.

Amongst the things pointed out in that note, copies of which were sent to you through our diplomatic channels, was the following:

The aggression of government of Kuwait, against Iraq has been two-fold; by encroaching upon our territories and oil fields, and by stealing our national wealth, such action is tantamount to military aggression. The Kuwaiti government's deliberate attempts to bring down the Iraqi economy is an aggression no smaller, in its consequences, than a military aggression.

Following President Hussein's address of 16 July 1990 and my note of 15 July 1990 to the Secretary-General of the Arab League, a number of Arab leaders intervened to help resolve this issue. It was agreed that a meeting be held on 30 July 1990 in Jeddah between His Excellency the Vice-Chairman of the Revolution Command Council and the Crown Prince of the former regime of Kuwait.

Many true Arabs who were, eager to see an acceptable settlement being achieved, expected the rulers of Kuwait would in that meeting abandon their arrogance, intransigence, and their attempts to harm Iraq. The behavior of the delegation of the Kuwaiti regime during the meeting was marked, however, by their prevarication, procrastination and a flagrant denial of Iraq's obvious and legitimate rights.

Thus the conclusion was confirmed that the former regime in Kuwait was bent on perpetrating its design to destroy the Iraqi economy and destabilize its political system. It is inconceivable, that such a small regime could entertain the perpetration of a conspiracy of this dimension against a big and strong country like Iraq without being supported by a great power. That power was the United States of America.

This dangerous conspiracy against Iraq led us to extend military assistance to the young revolutionaries of Kuwait in their uprising on 2 August 1990. On the following day, His Majesty King Hussein of the Hashimite Kingdom of Jordan, visited Iraq and informed President Saddam Hussein that he had made intensified contacts with a number of Arab leaders, and that there was a proposal for a small summit to be held in Jeddah on the 4th or 5th of August and attended by Iraq, Jordan, Egypt, Yemen and Saudi Arabia. President Saddam Hussein accepted the idea of this summit which was also confirmed during the visit made to Iraq on 4 August 1990, by His Excellency, Mr. Ali Abdullah Saleh, President of the Republic of Yemen.

This summit, which was to be held during the evening of Saturday, the 4th of August, or on Sunday the 5th, did not take place because of the intervention of the United States of America, on the very day for which the Arab Summit had been scheduled. President Bush asked his Defence Secretary to visit Saudi Arabia seeking the King's approval for US forces to be invited to Saudi Arabia. The US Defence Secretary arrived in Jeddah on the morning of 6 August and the US forces began entering Saudi Arabia on 7 August, the very next day. The speed with which this operation was started confirms two basic facts. The first, is that there was already a US military plan to ensure US domination of the Gulf region, (This has been confirmed by former US officials including Zbigniew Brzezinski), and this was the right time for its implementation. The second fact is that the United States deliberately aborted an Arab solution to the problem proposed for discussion at the planned Jeddah Summit of 5 August, 1990.

One day after the arrival of the US forces in Saudi Arabia, the government of Egypt proposed, on 8 August, that an Emergency Arab Summit Conference be held in Cairo. The call for this Summit was made without prior consultation with Iraq to, at least, ascertain whether President Saddam Hussein would be able to go to Cairo. Neither did we receive an official invitation from the host country, nor from the Secretariat of the League of Arab States as required by the regular procedures.

Despite this aberrant behavior on the part of the Egyptian Government, an Iraqi delegation went to Cairo, headed by RCC member and First-Deputy Prime Minister Mr. Taha Yassin Ramadan and including two other RCC members, DPM and Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz, and DPM Dr. Sa'doun Hammadi. On arrival in Cairo, the Iraqi delegation requested a meeting with President Mubarak. During the meeting, the Egyptian President assured the head of the Iraqi delegation that the objective of the summit was to conduct a "dialogue." Before the opening session on the next day, and prior to any consultation being conducted amongst the leaders present, the member-states of the Gulf Cooperation Council, along with Egypt and other states, presented a paper supporting the Saudi invitation to the US forces to Saudi Arabia and calling on other Arab states to send forces there too. This created resentment amongst the other leaders attending the summit, who demanded that the paper be withdrawn in order to enable the conference to enter into a serious dialogue. The Egyptian President, however, prevented any dialogue from being conducted in search of an acceptable solution. He forced the draft paper to a vote in a manner unprecedented in Arab conferences. This was how the second attempt at an Arab solution to the problem was aborted. The following states either voted against the paper, abstained or expressed their reservations on it: Jordan, the Yemen, Palestine, the Sudan, Libya, Algeria, Mauritania and Tunisia which had boycotted the meeting all together.

Dear Colleague,

This historical and factual presentation makes clear the fact that the issue in question is not merely a dispute over ordinary economic or border matters. We had tolerated such differences or disputes for twenty years, a period during which we sought to maintain the best of relations with the former rulers of Kuwait, in spite of their wicked conduct against Iraq. What we are dealing with now is a premeditated conspiracy, in which the former rulers of Kuwait participated willfully and in accordance with a plan supported by the United States of America, to destabilize the Iraqi economy and undermine its defence capabilities and the potential with which to face the Israel-Imperialist scheme of aggression and expansionism against the Arab homeland, the scheme aimed at imposing US hegemony over the region and its oil wealth in particular. This was in fact, as described in President Hussein's statement at the Baghdad Arab Summit and in my letter to the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, a war waged against Iraq.

As regards Iraq's relations with the other states of the region, including Saudi Arabia, none of them offer a case similar in any way to that of Kuwait both from the point of view of history and in terms of the nature of the bilateral relations. We have been keen to establish normal relations with all these states, and have been committed to all our obligations towards them within the framework of our fraternal links. We are keen to maintain these commitments for as long as the states concerned maintain their commitments.

In view of the spurious allegations concerning the so-called Iraqi threats to Saudi Arabia, we have affirmed in every way available to us that there is no Iraqi threat to Saudi Arabia or to any other country in the Gulf. We have made clear our willingness to provide all necessary guarantees required to that effect, whether on the bilateral level or within the framework of the League of Arab States. We have also stated that we would not object to Saudi Arabia calling in Arab forces for assistance or protection, if the Saudis were afraid, although we still see no basis whatsoever for this fabricated fear.

Another chapter of the problem has to do with the Security Council and the position it has adopted, on the first day of the events. The United States pushed the Security Council into adopting a resolution against Iraq on the basis of Chapter VII of the UN Charter. I am referring here to resolution 660 of 2 August 1990, which has no precedent of its kind in the whole history of the Security Council. The Council adopted this resolution without even giving Iraq the chance to be heard. It has always been normal practice in the Security Council, while dealing with international crises, to invite the Foreign Ministers of the parties concerned to attend the Council meetings

before a resolution is adopted. It was obvious that everything was being conducted under feverish US pressure. On the 6th of August, another unprecedented resolution was adopted to impose unjust sanctions against Iraq. Then three other resolutions were adopted for the same purpose. These were resolution 662 (9 August), resolution 664 (18 August) and resolution 665 (25 August, 1990). It was obvious that the United States had launched a full-scale campaign in which it exercised, overtly and covertly, all forms of pressure, intimidation and threats, economic and otherwise, in trying to get member-states to vote for those resolutions proposed by the United States.

On 12 August 1990, President Saddam Hussein announced an initiative in which he called for all outstanding issues in the region to be settled on the basis of the same criteria and principles. He expressed his genuine hope that this initiative would open the door for just and peaceful solutions of all the problems in the region. Western countries, however, rejected this initiative even before inquiring about it or asking for a copy of the text, thus confirming the double-standard they apply to regional and international disputes in comparison with their position towards Israel. These countries have never urged the Security Council to implement against Israel the many resolutions already adopted on the question of Palestine, its people and their rights. This has been their position despite the fact that Israel has been occupying the land of Palestine for several decades and continues to massacre the Palestinian people in all brutality while still occupying the Golan Heights of Syria and Southern Lebanon.

Iraq hereby warns against the dangers of the US scheme to impose its hegemony on the Arab nation, plunder its resources and prevent its development and progress. To allow the United States a free hand in dealing with regional problems in such an arrogant and contemptuous manner, while implicating other countries along with it, is a matter that constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security, the damages of which will not be confined to the interests of the developing third world countries, but will also affect Europe, Japan and all countries seeking to achieve independence in their positions and decisions.

As I address this message to Your Excellency, I trust that the situation shall be studied carefully, taking all facts and factors into consideration. I also hope that the international community shall cooperate in their efforts to confront the policy of aggression and adventurism being imposed by the United States of America upon Iraq and the region as a whole; the region that has, for decades, bitterly suffered from the US policy of hegemony and blackmail, and from the infamous alliance forged between the United States and Israel.

I hope that you shall consider dealing seriously with the historic initiative announced by President Saddam Hussein on 12 August 1990, and with the sincere Arab efforts aimed at finding comprehensive Arab solutions to the problems of the region.

I assure you that Iraq, with its faith in peace and justice, shall remain faithful to its belief in dialogue and in the constructive exchange of views with regard to all bilateral, regional and international issues.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the assurances of my highest regard.

[signed] Tariq Aziz

Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq

Interview with Foreign Minister Tariq 'Aziz by Fu'ad Matar, editor of *Al-Tadamun*, in Baghdad on 14 September 1990

[Matar] When we talk about "the Arab solution," what do we mean? Is it one of those many initiatives around or is it a plan not yet finalized? What are the characteristics of such a solution?

[Aziz] When we talk about the Arab solution, we must adhere to principle. There is a certain Arab situation with different attitudes toward it. There are also differences on how problems can be solved and how stability and normal Arab relations can be restored. There must be some Arab method, therefore. From the outset, we were ready to discuss the matter within an Arab context. On 3 August 1990, His Majesty King Hussein visited us and told the President that he had contacted King Fahd, President Mubarak, and President 'Ali 'Abdallah Salih, and that they all agreed to hold a summit in Jeddah on 4 or 5 August to discuss developments. The President accepted the idea of the summit, but said that he might not be able to attend personally because of the current situation. He said Iraq would be represented by a delegation capable of presenting Iraq's viewpoint.

On the following day, President 'Ali 'Abdallah Salih visited us and discussed the subject, and we renewed our readiness to attend. We were told that King Fahd would contact us to extend the invitation, and we waited on Sunday but the invitation did not come; it did not come on Monday either, and on Tuesday, we discovered that U.S. forces had arrived in Saudi Arabia. I personally saw the U.S. Defense Secretary on television saying that President Bush ordered him on Sunday, the day the mini-summit was to be held, to leave immediately for Saudi Arabia. He left on Sunday, arrived Monday morning, and met with King Fahd in the evening. At that meeting it was decided to implement the plan of U.S. presence in Saudi Arabia. We conclude from this that the first Arab attempt was aborted by Saudi Arabia itself.

On the day following the arrival of U.S. forces; that is, on Wednesday 8 August 1990, the Egyptian president called for a summit without consulting anyone; he extended the invitation via the radio. Nevertheless, we attended, and it was clear that the invitation for the summit meant, without doubt, a summit without President Saddam Hussein, because it was not possible for the President at that particular time, when the skies were full of U.S. planes transporting troops to Saudi Arabia, to fly to Cairo. A summit without President Saddam Hussein was clearly the intended aim. When an invitation to a summit without the attendance of President Saddam Hussein is extended, and when the invitation comes immediately after the arrival of U.S. forces, it means taking the Arab solution out of consideration. For, how could the Arab leaders consider an Arab solution after the foreigners had been invited in, and when the main negotiator--President Saddam Hussein--was absent?

Despite this, we went to Cairo. We were told that the summit was for holding a dialogue, but on the next day, and shortly before the opening session, we found ourselves faced with a paper prepared in advance and approved by 10 countries. We were surprised, and so were the others who had not been consulted. We felt that something had been "cooked" and that the decision had already been made--namely, inviting foreign forces in and calling for the dispatch of Arab forces to add the required decoration. Hence, we concluded that there was a plan and insistence on aborting the Arab solution. Some leaders considered setting up a committee to discuss the subject and to visit Baghdad to talk with President Saddam Hussein, but the Egyptian President suppressed these attempts rudely and in a manner unprecedented in Arab meetings. What was wanted, clearly, was to get the seal of approval for foreign intervention.

Since the foreign intervention began, which has been supported by the parties that drew up the Cairo paper, plotting against the Arab solution and gambling on the U.S. solution began. The U.S. solution is aimed at committing aggression against Iraq and imposing U.S. and consequently Israeli-hegemony over the entire region. Naturally, the national Arab forces, sincere leaderships, and national popular movements do not accept that, and they continue to look for an Arab solution.

We have no ready-made solutions in hand. Regarding the point concerning our view of an Arab solution, we say there are essential Arab problems that must be resolved within the Arab framework. The United States and its followers concentrate on one issue, which is the situation in Kuwait, and they ignore the other major problems in the Arab world. These problems create military, political, and economic instability, and problems for Arab security. Therefore, they tip the balance in favor of Israel and the United States against the Arabs. This is against the objective we sought at the Baghdad summit when we sought to formulate a new Arab order that not only creates a military balance to counter the Israeli and U.S. threat, but also a military, political, and security balance so that we can enter a new phase.

We used to compare this phase to European unity. We can achieve something like what the Europeans have achieved and move on to a new phase. However, what happened was that plotting began for striking against Arab power in Iraq, which constituted the nucleus or the major basis of military balance, and to return the region to U.S. hegemony.

The Arab solution remains essential, even if it is not available today or tomorrow. It remains essential because we are one Arab nation and should resolve our problems as an Arab nation; but this solution should not be based on deals, where a deal is prepared behind the scenes and the issue ends on its basis. An Arab solution is the one that deals with the roots of Arab problems and brings about a new political, economic, and military Arab order that covers all aspects of the new Arab order.

[Matar] What do you have to say about the proposed Arab initiatives?

[Aziz] Ideas are being proposed, but they are still immature. I cannot comment on these ideas, but I repeat what I have said in my answer to the first question: An Arab solution can lead us to a new Arab order. The solution, as I indicated, should not be mechanical or a deal. It must establish the new Arab order.

[Matar] You say the invitation for the Cairo summit was unconventional. Is calling for a summit through a statement broadcast over the radio or by an official news agency not considered an official invitation?

[Aziz] We did not discuss formalities. We heard the invitation over the radio and went there because there was an Arab meeting. We attend meetings. We did not argue about formalities, but what happened was a matter concerning the content. The invitation for the summit came after the arrival of U.S. forces. This is a very important fact in the issue. The Egyptian President did not seek dialogue and did not propose ideas for discussion in order to develop them later into a committee to discuss resolutions or points of view. He and those who sided with him surprised us the next day--without any discussions--with a draft resolution laid out on our chairs. We came to the session and found that a paper had been distributed. Afterward, the Egyptian president opened the session, delivered a speech, and concluded the session with a call for another meeting.

We returned to the meeting at six o'clock. He did not allow any time for discussion, but asked us to approve the resolution. The voting was held under pressure, and he announced the end of the session and left. He did not even respect the formalities in the final speech; he neither greeted those attending nor thanked them for accepting the invitation, as is the case in all conferences. Such formalities are taken into consideration, even in ministerial meetings, so what would be the case in summit meetings?

The Egyptian President reached a conclusion that a formal majority supported the paper, and he said: The session is over. He left the hall while his guests were still sitting. This shows that what was wanted was merely a farce in which the Arab leaders would meet to rubberstamp a prepared resolution in order for it to be said that this was an Arab decision, which would give a false legitimacy to the American presence in the region and to the American solution to the issue.

[Matar] In light of King Hassan II's contact with you and the cordial treatment accorded to his personal envoy, who visited you and who was received by President Saddam Hussein despite Moroccan forces' deployment in Saudi Arabia--is this a special case with Morocco only, or is it a step indicating that the road is open between Iraq and countries deploying forces in Saudi Arabia, and that the channels of dialogue are open and can be further activated?

[Aziz] We on our part have not cut off the lines of communication; they cut them off. We are still open for dialogue with any party, even the United States. I informed the U.S. Charge d'Affaires officially that we are ready for dialogue. And when an envoy of a president of an Arab state visits us, we welcome him and listen to his opinion. This was the case with the envoy of King Hassan II.

[Matar] This happens when somebody comes to visit you. Is there an intention to embark on initiatives with Saudi Arabia for example?

[Aziz] If there is a readiness for a dialogue, Iraq does not hold back from it.

[Matar] When the Arab Cooperation Council (ACC) was established, there was an atmosphere of optimism. And Egypt's departure indicated that harmony among the members of the Council was not real. Will the Council remain, or has it ended with Egypt's departure?

[Aziz] The experiment of the ACC was an honest and earnest attempt we made to form what we called for, that is, a new Arab order. You know that, since the beginning of the 80's, President Saddam Hussein has been calling for a new Arab order. In February 1980, he called for a new Arab order based on the charter he proposed on that date. At the Amman summit held in the same year, he reiterated the call. The war then came and obstructed--in addition to the initiatives--our capabilities to implement our ideas.

With the end of the war, President Saddam Hussein renewed the call for his ideas through the agreements he presented to the Arab countries--not to use force to solve problems, not to interfere in internal problems, the need for more interest in the serious economic contrast between the Arab countries, and holding to fraternal dealings among the Arab countries.

At the Casablanca summit, he spoke strongly about the Arab situation in Lebanon and the violations against Lebanese sovereignty. We then sought to establish the ACC within this framework. However, the Egyptian Government acted after these events in a way completely contrary to the direction in which we sought to work in accordance with Egypt and our brothers in the ACC. The Egyptian Government showed that it was a satellite of the United States.

I cannot foretell the future and cannot know whether or not the ACC will remain. However, I wonder: How can we work within the framework of such a council while there are two stands: A national stand on one side and a stand that is subservient to America on the other?

[Matar] We note that the United States sent a taped message from President Bush to the Iraqi people on the same day it dispatched Secretary Baker to Damascus. Was this meant to provoke you, or is there something deeper?

[Aziz] Concerning the Syrian regime, I say that it took the American side at the Cairo meeting, contrary to its public slogans. This again proves that the slogans of the Syrian regime are one thing and its actual policies are something else. It is completely against Iraq. This time, it did not even bother to keep the flimsy veil behind which it hid during the Iraq-Iran war, when it said that it appeased Iran because it regarded it as a reserve force against imperialism and Israel.

It openly chose to side with the American camp, and we were not surprised because we knew the nature of this regime, which is essentially opposed to anything pan-Arab.

As for the U.S. President's taped statement, the Americans--and I mean the U.S. Administration--were displeased with Iraq's several messages to the American people, such as the President's messages during his visit to the foreign guests and his many initiatives, which were carried live on the U.S. television network, CNN, whose coverage of the Iraqi attitude has been good. This displeased the administration. As usual, the Americans resorted to blackmail. They said: We also want to talk to the Iraqi people. The Iraqi people are politically conscious and they hear what the Americans say on the radio all the time. They can also draw their own conclusions. Nevertheless, we said alright, if you want to address a message from Iraqi television, send it. We will broadcast it and we might reply to it. [The message was broadcast on 16 September 1990.]

[Matar] Do you think that the U.S. President's aim was to hold a dialogue, or to create embarrassment?

[Aziz] He intended to embarrass us on the basis that the U.S. television networks broadcast many interviews with President Saddam Hussein and others and, therefore, reciprocal treatment was in order. They thought we would not welcome this. They would then go back to American public opinion, which began to listen

attentively to President Saddam Hussein, and say: Look what Iraq is doing. It does not give a chance to the other viewpoint. We said: We are prepared to hear the other viewpoint, and it will have no effect on our people. Here I would like to point out that an ordinary Iraqi citizen, when asked by the television commentator about Bush's address, gave a very significant answer in very elementary and simple English. He said: We hear Bush and believe Saddam.

[Matar] How do you view the Helsinki summit? Do you think that what was reported did not include everything that was agreed? Do you base your position on what was reported, or on what was not? Is the fact that President Bush did not recognize objective Iraqi realities; namely, Iraq's leadership, its important oil role, and its military strength, was one of the causes of the crisis and that such recognition could have been the key to a solution? Furthermore, does the USSR recognize these realities, which President Bush does not recognize?

[Aziz] I was in Moscow only days before the Helsinki summit was held and I held profound talks with the Soviet President. I conveyed our viewpoint to him and listened to his views on the political matters that I presented to him; namely, that if the Americans imagined that they would be satisfied with a military action, or that the military action that they intend to mount would be confined to what they call a "surgical operation," they would be harboring an illusion, because we will fight them and continue to fight them in defense of our sovereignty and rights and will strike at their interests as far as our arms can reach. We have the resources and determination to do that.

I also told President Gorbachev that the battle with America enjoys formidable popular support in the Arab and Islamic worlds, and that people, in fact, are longing for struggle against the United States. We will not initiate military action, but this fact must be taken into consideration, because the public in our country and the Islamic world at large is eager for such a battle. This means the people will continue the fight and will attack U.S. interests whenever possible. I also stressed to him that we do not fear U.S. threats, and that if the Americans think they frighten us by their buildup, then they are mistaken. If there was a desire for a peaceful solution, on the other hand, then we would be ready. But what kind of a peaceful solution? The solution must be just and involve all problems in the region, because to the Arab people, the destiny of the Shaikh of Kuwait is not more important than the destiny of Jerusalem.

I also told President Gorbachev that every citizen in Iraq, Jerusalem, Morocco, or Algeria considers the fate of Jerusalem a million times more important than the fate of an ignorant, reactionary shaikh who seized and squandered the wealth of the nation.

The Americans, of course, have their priorities, and we as Arabs have our own priorities. After all, the Arabs cannot possibly shed their Arab skin. I do not know to what extent these ideas and principles were conveyed to the U.S. side, but we felt from the Helsinki summit that the Soviet Union did not support the U.S. military blockade, underscored a peaceful settlement, and pointed out the importance of the Arab factor in dealing with the situation, which is a central point among those I made to the Soviet President.

The solution must be Arab, and if we talk about international participation, then this participation must lead to a just and comprehensive solution to the Palestine question, because the issue has obvious international dimensions. But the situation in the Gulf cannot be solved except by the Arabs. An international solution is out of the question, at least at the first stage.

Soviet talk about an Arab solution at the Helsinki summit shows some understanding of our position, but we must not be deluded. The USSR is weak in the face of the United States, and it cannot come up with a position parallel to the U.S. position. The U.S. position in the equation is more effective than the Soviet position, regardless of the true nature of the Soviet position. This is a fact. So far, there are two superpowers, but some big countries are weaker than other big countries, and this was made clear by the Security Council resolutions: the Soviets would say things or talk about things in a language different than the American language, but at the end of the day, they would vote for the resolutions formulated by the Americans and the West.

Concerning Bush's acknowledgement of Iraq's status, I say that the U.S. Administration and the colonialist reactionary forces in the West, which are under the influence of Zionism, began their campaign against Iraq once the cease-fire with Iran was reached, and it became clear to us that they wanted the war with Iran to continue or, if it stopped, that Iraq should come out weak and preoccupied with its wounds so that it could not play an independent Arab role. But when they discovered that Iraq came out of the war militarily strong and with high spirits and pan-Arab view toward the future, they immediately moved into full attack against it. Campaigns against us have become common since August 1988. You live in the West and feel it. Every U.S., British, French, Dutch, or other newspaper or magazine, and all other news media along the U.S. line or under the Zionist influence, want to destroy or weaken Iraq and portray it as a threat to the world.

I was talking with a lady working for a U.S. television network this morning. I said to her: A few months ago a magazine--I believe it was *NEWSWEEK*--described President Saddam Hussein as the American people's number one enemy. Why? I asked. Neither President Saddam nor his government had, up to that date, done any harm to the people or government of the United States. We had killed none of you, and perpetrated no unfriendly

or illegal act against the people or Government of the United States. We were selling oil to the United States and buying wheat and other commodities from it. And we now want normal relations based on mutual respect.

Nevertheless, they portrayed our leader as the enemy number one of the American people. Why? Because he said: "If Israel attacks us, we will retaliate." What is required, then, is that no political, economic, nor military Arab force that can balance the Israeli threat should arise in the region. Amid the current reshuffling of cards in the region, we--the Arabs--should make the correct conclusion; namely, that there is American Western determination--and I do not exclude the Western countries that adopted relatively moderate stands during the seventies and the eighties--that an independent Arab force that can consolidate Arab independence must not emerge.

They plotted against and annihilated Jamal 'Abd-al-Nasir, and turned Egypt into an American farm. They forced the wealthy oil states to move in their orbit. This was proved by the developments in August. These states; that is, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states, are American protectorates. An independent force with pan-Arab vision in Iraq is, therefore, prohibited. And it is not only a question of oil. Egypt had no oil, and yet the force established by 'Abd-al-Nasir as an independent force with a future vision had to be destroyed. Regardless of our differences with 'Abd-al-Nasir at that time, we must admit that the man had a pan-Arab vision.

Talking about oil, we wonder: Why does Bush approve of Fahd possessing 15 or 16 percent of world oil reserves, of Jabir al-Ahmad possessing 10 percent, and of Shaikh Zayid possessing seven or eight percent, and yet rejects Iraq possessing 20 percent? If it has to do with selling and buying, then this matter is of no concern to him, because Iraq is ready to sell its oil for reasonable prices. When U.S. television asked me what we would do if we controlled 20 percent of world oil reserves, I said: Every salesman cares about buyers. Those who sell cars care about those who buy cars, and those who set for their cars prices that buyers cannot afford will be making a mistake. The same applies to oil. Yes, we want better prices than the old ones, which declined as a result of the deliberate policy of the former Kuwaiti rulers and the rulers of the United Arab Emirates, but we must seek a price that the buyers can afford; otherwise, we cannot sell our oil and earn money.

Moreover, when we make better earnings from this basic commodity, what are we going to do with the money? We are a government with experience. We spend the money on our people; we improve the standard of living; this would mean development--factories, universities, schools, and electricity stations.

[Matar] How did you find the brothers in Iran? When, do you think, the Iraqi-Iranian accord will be achieved? How deep is confidence between you? And what can we say to those who found in Iraqi-Iranian normalization, as it happened, a return to the starting point?

[Aziz] We assessed the visit I and the Iraqi delegation paid to Iran as positive. This is the first visit at this level since 1979. It followed President Saddam Hussein's 14 August initiative in which he expressed Iraq's readiness to withdraw, exchange prisoners of war, and establish relations in accordance with the principles outlined in the message to the Iranian leadership. When we visited Tehran, the withdrawal had already been accomplished and the exchange of POW's had started. Both of us found that we were going through a new phase with the road open to normal relations and good neighborliness. We stressed the desire to establish normal relations with Iran, and the Iranians did the same.

I cannot predict more than what I have said. However, I can say that we welcome more openness in relations with Iran. And nor can I predict because this process must be built carefully and step by step. Within two days, we will receive an Iranian delegation to follow up some points that were raised during my visit to Tehran. The Iranian foreign minister will visit us in response to our visit to Tehran. Thus, we can reach the objectives sought from our visit--namely, comprehensive and lasting peace and neighborly relations.

Describing the normalization of relations between Iraq and Iran, or describing President Saddam Hussein's initiative as a return to square one or a relinquishment of the previous position is an clumsy and tendentious description. Essential facts must be taken into account. Iran seriously threatened Iraq in 1979 and 1980; it also threatened the region. In 1990, when President Saddam Hussein launched his initiatives and sent messages to the Iranian leadership--between April and 14 August 1990--Iraq was not threatened by Iran. It went through the experience and emerged strong and healthy from it. When a person is threatened, he acts one way and when he is strong and healthy he acts in light of the power and vigor he possesses. This happens throughout the world.

Let us take the situation now between Iraq and the West. Had the West abandoned its threat to Iraq, would we continue to call for struggle over radio, television, and press? Why? If the West does not threaten us or encroach on our interests, why don't we speak with normal language and establish normal relations? Therefore, this is the equation that governs relations among peoples and countries. When you are threatened you defend yourself, and when you are strong and healthy, and when the threats from the other side stop, reason dictates a different approach.

[Matar] As a writer and journalist, I understand the Iraqi position. Some foreign colleagues in the BBC asked me one question: What is President Saddam relying on in the confrontation? My answer was always summarized after explanation in the following way: Saddam relies on himself, on his belief in his cause, on God in the first place, and on the justice of his cause. Does he rely on other things?

[Aziz] No. You have put your finger on the truth.

[Matar] What I mean by other things is his reliance on a very dangerous weapon.

[Aziz] Weapons are made by men. If we have a dangerous or less-dangerous weapon, it is made by us. And if we rely on it, this is not unusual. President Saddam Hussein relies precisely on the fairness of the cause for which we are struggling; he also relies on his people's belief in this cause, on his people's unlimited readiness for sacrifice and their defiance of death, and on the Arab nation, which stands on his side in the battle.

The picture is clear to me. The Arab nation--as a nation--is with Saddam Hussein in this battle. The corrupt governments and politicians are linked with America. This is another subject. The nation in its essence and conscience is with Saddam Hussein in this battle. If the leader is convinced that his cause is fair and his people support him, what more does he need to wage the battle? The leader that has this asset and does not wage the battle is not a leader. In this battle, Saddam Hussein is in harmony with the will of his people and the Arab nation. He speaks of the capability of the people of Iraq and the Arab nation to offer the required sacrifices that will lead us to victory. We are optimistic.

MESSAGE OF PEACE FROM SADDAM HUSSEIN, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF IRAQ, TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

IN THE NAME OF GOD, THE COMPASSIONATE THE MERCIFUL

26 September 1990

"O Humankind, We Have created you Male and Female and made you into Races and Tribes. That you may Know One Another. Surely the Noblest among you in the Sight of God is the most God fearing of you. God is all- Knowing, all-Aware."

----Saddaq Allahul Adhim (God's is the word of Truth)

People of the United States of America,

Assalamu Alaikum (peace be upon you).

I say Assalamu Alaikum, rather than "Good Morning" or "Good Evening", which would have been more in line with the ways of the West, because when the Arabs greet other people, they use phrase "Assalamu Alaikum". Hence you see at the outset that the Arabs believe in peace even when they greet non-Arabs. They also commence their address to others with words of good wishes, optimism, and a desire for peace. This is part of the tradition and heritage of the Arab Nation and Islam to which we are honored to belong.

I address you now after President Bush has appeared on our National television. He expressed to the people of Iraq his views on the current crisis in our region. As I address you to express our point of view, within the space of time available to me, my concern will be the great majority of the American people, not those involved in the business of politics. It is the great majority of the people that constitutes the essence of any legitimate human issue in accordance with the concept of democracy. Accordingly, I find it necessary, to reiterate certain matters already known to professional politicians through their work. President Bush has already appeared on Iraqi national television and presented his views in full after he voiced his desire to do so on August 30, 1990, along with his displeasure at the appearance of Saddam Hussein on US television. Once we had known of President Bush's desire, and out of respect for American and Western public opinion in general, we welcomed the idea, through our Minister of Information. Now that President Bush has expressed his viewpoint, I should like to present to you some important views held by our country and our Nation.

Bush has said to the people of Iraq that the US administration had no quarrel with them. In proof of this, he said, the administration had allowed the Iraqis to purchase some of the goods they needed, particularly grains, from the US market. He also said that the US administration had also helped bring about the cease-fire in the Iraq-Iran war.

The US President did not hit the truth when he said the US administration had no quarrel with the people of Iraq. We have evidence that President Bush was himself involved in the 1986 Iran-Gate or Iran-Contra conspiracy against Iraq when he was Reagan's Vice-President. This is a well known fact documented in the dossier of the case. We received an apology from President Reagan over that affair, which he described as a mistake not to be repeated. We accepted the apology which was conveyed to us through the US Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Richard Murphy, on May 11, 1987.

their sheikhdom until it reached al-Mitlaa', and then expanded their sheikhdom further by an additional distance of tens of kilometers between 1963 and 1968. Then the rulers of Kuwait exploited our preoccupation with the war between us and Iran to expand further at our expense, by using our southern oil fields to acquire new oil wells from which to funnel additional oil for their benefit.

No warning, however repeatedly stated, could deter them from that course of action. We have official documents substantiating all this, which we place at the disposal of whoever is interested to have them.

As President Bush was delivering his statement with the help of an auto-cue, he made the calculated move taking out a piece of paper in which was written a citation from something I had previously said in relation to the Syrian regime's occupation of Lebanon. Granting that the words Mr. Bush cited were literally mine on that occasion, I suggest, however, that he should have considered the matter more carefully before passing his judgement, explicitly or implicitly, that, having deplored the Syrian interference in, and occupation of, Lebanon, we have fallen into a contradiction through our action in Kuwait.

The case of Lebanon is totally different from that of Kuwait, as I have already pointed out through the facts I have reviewed. Lebanon did not conspire against Syria, while the former Sheikh of Kuwait Jabir al-Ahmed, and his clique did conspire against Iraq. Lebanon committed no aggression against Syria, while the former regime of Kuwait perpetrated aggression against Iraq. In any case, the motives were actively different in the two situations. Although Mr. Bush meant, sought, through quoting my words, to underscore a contradiction between what we say and what we do, in a vain attempt to justify the deployment of his armies, it remains a fact that Mr. Bush had failed to oppose the occupation of Lebanon by the Syrian regime. Nor did any of his allies nor the traitors involved with him in the conspiracy against the Arab and Islamic Nation, oppose that occupation. Indeed, the US administration had encouraged the Syrian regime at the outset. This may well be supported by the fact that Mr. Bush has been keen recently to reward the Syrian regime for the services it has rendered. He dispatched Secretary of State Baker on an official visit to Damascus on 13-14 September, and gave the Syrian regime generous financial rewards from the United States and its allies both inside and outside the region.

So what has been regarded by Mr. Bush to be an imputation on us, through the text he quoted from my speech, is in fact a shameful imputation on Bush himself and on all those who adopt double-standards and conflicting criteria in their thinking and behavior and in the solutions they seek to impose on issues, be they those of Lebanon, Palestine or of any other party.

On top of all this, and in order that you may know the extent of the damage caused to an ancient people through that black conspiracy spearheaded by the rulers of Kuwait against Iraq, let me give you just one example in the financial field from which you can make your own judgements. The Iraqi dinar fell to around one twentieth of the Kuwaiti dinar after it had been higher in value than the Kuwaiti currency in 1980. Having seen all doors closed in front of us for a solution that might reassure the Iraqi people about their present and their future, including the failure of the Jeddah negotiations of 31 July 1990, which we conducted with the rulers of Kuwait via a delegation from our side headed by the Vice-Chairman of our Revolutionary Command Council and a delegation from their side headed by the former Prime Minister of Kuwait, we were left with no other alternative but to take the action which we took on 2 August 1990, in order to halt the danger, remove a historical injustice, and place Iraq in a position of self-reassurance and of capability to serve its Nation and humanity at large.

Contrary to what President Bush tells you about Iraq having invaded Kuwait without any Kuwaiti provocation against Iraq, here are some extracts from the warnings which we repeatedly expressed in public to the rulers of Kuwait but in vain. These are the warnings which we made in public. There are others which remain unpublished.

We addressed the rulers of Kuwait in the presence of the Arab heads of state during a meeting of the Baghdad Summit Conference on 30 May 1990, by saying:

War takes place sometimes through soldiers and damage is inflicted by explosives, killings or coup attempts. At other times, war is launched through economic means. To those who do not mean to wage war against Iraq, I say that this is a kind of war against Iraq.

Then I made the following statement on 16 July 1990, in my annual address to the Nation, celebrating the anniversary of Iraq's National Day (the anniversary of the 17-30 July Revolution):

Because the people of Iraq, who have suffered this deliberate injustice, have enough faith in their right to self-defence and the defence of their rights, they shall never forget the saying: *"Rather heads be cut off, than sustenance."* If words fail to provide protection, then decisive action must be taken to restore the usurped rights to their owners.

Does not all this constitute warnings made in advance, but in vain? Was there not a provocation, indeed a flagrant aggression, against Iraq? Is not all this evidence enough for understanding the measures we took on and after 2 August 1990?

President Bush is aware of all of this and of more facts substantiating the meaning and legitimacy of the measures that we have taken. His administration followed these events closely.

The US government and congress were escalating one campaign after another against Iraq, and drafting further measures to impose a boycott and blockade against Iraq in political, economic and other fields. All this had already happened prior to 2 August 1990. These US measures were being taken against us as a reaction to our repeated warnings to the government of Kuwait.

Now after all that has taken place, and regardless of any agreement or disagreement on the method used, is it practical or logical to call for things to be returned to how they were before 2 August 1990, including the return of the Sheikhs of Kuwait who spent their time hoarding wealth and women to the extent that some of them became unable to recognize their own children in view of their great numbers. Indeed the situation was such that one of them one day expressed his desire to marry a young girl whom he had come across by chance on a previous occasion, only to discover that the girl in question was in fact one of his own daughters, God save us all!!!

On 5 August 1990, it was agreed that an Arab Summit Conference would be held amongst Yemen, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Iraq in order to discuss the new situation and find a solution to the crisis. Instead of convening this conference to which the parties concerned had all agreed, we were surprised to see the idea of the conference frozen by the friends of the United States which had given them instructions to that effect, with the arrival of the armies in the Land of Arab and Islamic sanctities in the Arabian Peninsula, and by the other decisions of the United States. This was how we and the international community lost the opportunity to find an Arab solution in a calm inter-Arab discussion of the issue. While this has been the case in the current crisis, we know that both the United States and its allies had encouraged an Arab solution to the Lebanese question for which an Arab committee was formed with the encouragement of the United States and the blessings later of the Security Council.

Saudi-Arabia was the prime mover in that affair. You know, ladies and gentlemen, that the people of Lebanon have made a more vital contribution to humanity than the Sheikhs of Kuwait could ever do. Yet we see the US administration exerting tireless efforts to appease the ruler of Syria who occupies Lebanon. The statements issued in Damascus, at the end of Baker's visit on September 13-14, reveal this fact.

The question is therefore one of politics, not of principles, contrary to what Bush has tried to tell us in his message to the people of Iraq. Since the issue is a political one, not one of principle, in actual US policy, and as long as the question remains a matter of opinion in which each one views matters on the basis of his own judgement and interests, let us then resort to dialogue, rather than to arms, as the road to a common understanding and to acceptable solutions. In such a situation, the Arabs will be better equipped to resolve their problems amongst themselves. If it is desired that the international community should participate in resolving the crisis and problems of the region as a whole, then the best course to adopt towards this end will be what we called for in our initiative of 12 August 1990, when we proposed that all the issues of the region, in Palestine, Lebanon and the Gulf should be discussed together and on the same level in the Security Council with a view to setting a uniform standard and criteria to be applied to all issues while taking into consideration the special nature and background of each one of them.

This will be the way that can seriously lead to a comprehensive and lasting solution to all the problems and crises of the region, in the forefront of which is the Palestinian question without whose solution the region can never regain its peace or stability.

Those who view with responsibility the security of the region must address all the factors preceding the 2nd of August 1990, beginning with the Palestinian question and the occupation of Lebanon by the Syrian army. They should also view the question of Kuwait with realism and in the light of its historical background as an integral part of Iraq. We have proposed that initiative which seeks to resolve all outstanding issues in the region in a manner that ensures the achievement of comprehensive and lasting peace and security.

Do you know what has happened, ladies and gentlemen? Bush rejected our initiative even before seeing its text!! And when we knew that the US administration was planning military action against Iraq based in the beginning on the false pretext that Iraq had intended to invade Saudi Arabia, a pretext dismissed by naked facts, it occurred to us that one of the means of giving the US administration a better chance for thinking, while allowing all parties concerned additional time which could be used for dialogue, would be to keep some foreigners, including US citizens as guests in the houses of our staff at some scientific and economic establishments. This was measure, used along with others, in order to prevent the outbreak of a devastating war whose damage would be incalculable to those rushing into it.

In any event, we are only human and we feel the pain of having had to take this measure, in spite of the fact that there are those who keep telling us that the imposition of an economic blockade against Iraq, depriving its people of their food, medicine and even children's milk, is in itself an act of war which allows us, under

international law, to detain the subjects of the countries responsible for the blockade. This was what the United States government itself did, during the Second World War, when it detained even its own citizens of Japanese origin. Yet I still say that we are truly pained by this and wish to see the people of Iraq and its National Assembly given a guarantee or pronouncement from the United States of America pledging its commitment not to launch war or aggression against Iraq, a pledge that would enable us immediately to allow all foreigners to leave the country if they so wished. This was what we proposed in our initiative of 19 August 1990, which was again rejected by the US administration immediately and without prior discussion or consideration.

I have expressed publicly my desire to enter a TV debate or discussion with Mr. Bush in order to let the world public opinion, including that of the American people, know the facts in detail. But Mr. Bush has turned down this proposal which is why you find me forced now to burden you with details. A public TV discussion with Mr. Bush would have generated greater awareness among viewers everywhere and given them a better chance to make their own judgements.

In spite of this, however, Mr. Bush has complained to you that he could not predict what Saddam Hussein would do or know how Saddam Hussein would think. I ask you, in God's name: how could Mr. Bush know Saddam Hussein, or his comrades in the leadership, when Mr. Bush refuses to have a direct discussion with Saddam Hussein or enter into direct debate with him on television?

When we invite Mr. Bush to a discussion we do not mean to beg his or any party's acceptance of the idea. We proposed the debate basically out of our respect for world public opinion, including the public opinion of the United States. Our objective in such a debate is only to disclose the lies and false allegations that are being made, so that people are better informed about the issue in question and hence better equipped to make their own decisions on the basis of what they see as clear and concrete facts.

Should not the opportunity of the debate or the discussion be seized upon by the parties concerned in order that opponents may come to know more about each other? If only Mr. Bush viewed the matter in a truly responsible and serious manner, free from any preconceived objectives, would he still have refused to enter into the proposed TV debate. If Mr. Bush had truth on his side, why should he evade a direct debate or discussion?

Saddam Hussein's way of thinking is no deep secret as Mr. Bush seems to suggest. Saddam Hussein's comrades in the leadership, the people of Iraq and the Arab Nation as well as good people all over the world, know him well and can draw their own conclusions about what he has to say in relation to any forthcoming measure taken towards public events which call for a response through words or action. There is nothing hidden in the policy of Iraq; but Mr. Bush has no agents planted in our leadership; nor does he have many spies in our society as indeed some of the US authorities concerned have publicly complained.

If Mr. Bush and other professional politicians in the West wanted to know more about the leadership in Iraq then we say the following: The leadership of Iraq is a group of God-fearing mortals, sharing the beliefs of all true worshippers of God aspiring to please the Almighty, devoted to the service of their people, refusing to serve tyrants, un-enticed by temptation, and un-intimidated by the threats of tyranny. We serve our people and Nation deeply and sincerely, and through this service we see ourselves to be serving humanity at large. We are proud to refuse serving tyrants. We protect with our very eyes the rights and the resources of our people. We neither plunder our people's wealth nor keep it to ourselves in banks as is being done by the allies, nay the servants, of the US administration amongst the rulers of the region. We are serious when we address matters of importance, compassionate amongst ourselves and towards all God-fearing and genuine servants of God. Firm in the face of blasphemy, injustice and the exploitation that oppress and starve the poor, we do not bend in the fight for truth, and are fair in determining what we should take or give. We reject the subjugation of people by any force and call for liberty to be granted to all as commanded by God. Whenever called upon, we remain fighters in the service of God and truth, freedom fighters against injustice and its perpetrators, always true to our word.

If these signs are insufficient enough for the right conclusions to be made by the US administration or others, then this means that those concerned do not value these qualities, or deem them necessary in those whom they regard to be their friends amongst the rulers of the region. They are not used to seeing any of these attributes in those rulers, a fact which is not our fault. The guilt is theirs and it is they alone who will bear the consequence. The day for which we prepare ourselves is the day of judgement before God, our people and history.

We respect world public opinion when it is given the chance to be formed only on objective and fair bases. Anything other than this will be something planted by the devils and can only lead to the abyss, yielding no fruit and bringing nothing but vice to its reaper. The impact of God's punishment will be as heavy as the acts of those tempted to go astray.

We, as a people and a Nation, ladies and gentlemen, desire peace much as do the good amongst you. We want peace but we want it to be comprehensive and durable, rather than just a temporary and superficial arrangement leading to an even more violent explosion at a later stage. We do not want war in which we have had enough experience and whose details are well known to us. While our difficult circumstances and the war have provided us with the resilience required for the responsibility and the honor of defending our homeland and principles, those same circumstances and war provided us with ample opportunities to consider deeply and

patiently any step which we may take, while holding the responsibility of such a step in honor and firmness. We fear no threats from tyrants and will not fall prey to their temptation.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Bush is sending your sons to a war that has no human value or meaning save fatal arrogance fueled by the capabilities of a superpower used to issuing commands which the weak have to obey. All must remember that God is omnipotent. Mr. Bush wants to bring back the sorrows of the United States and humanity by repeating the Vietnam experience, only this time the ordeal will be more violent, demanding greater sacrifices and bigger losses.

Bush tells you, ladies and gentlemen, that he and others are capable of inflicting quick strikes against their targets and end the war that way. You should know, however, (and here I don't mean to issue a threat, for we threaten no one, but only to describe faithfully how we see things and what our decisions are) you should know that if Mr. Bush decided to start a war, it would not be up to him to stop that war. The end of such a war would very much be linked to its impact and to the resolve of the people that has decided to confront tyranny with unyielding strength for as long as this people and its Nation remain on the side of truth.

The United States, ladies and gentlemen, will not lose anything if the devil of aggression and war were to be removed from Mr. Bush's eyebrows, and if the means of war and destruction were to be removed from the area and the burden of occupation and degradation of Arab and Moslem sanctities were to be lifted. But the Iraqis and the Arabs, on the other hand, would lose their humanity and their opportunity for a free life in dignity, should Mr. Bush have his way in achieving the desire of his ill-motivated self. The Arabs would be in a circumstance, void of honor or meaning, and without a presence to be proud of or a future ensuring life for them and their children. Whenever we have talked in the past and whenever we find it our duty to remind others of the qualities of the Iraqi people and our human role, of the qualities of the Arab Nation and its human role, we also mention the depth of civilization established through their minds and efforts, the culture which they pioneered to the benefit of humanity as a whole. We say that the depth of civilization in Iraq stretches back to more than 5000 years and that it was Iraq which first taught humankind the form of script and writing more than 5000 years ago. Hammurabi enacted his famous Code around 4500 years ago. The lands of the Arabs have always been, by God's choice, the place of descent for divine messages and the cradle for God's messengers. The Arabs have always been and still are the apostles of the constant faith entrusted with the task of spreading the word of God all over the world.

The guidance and faith that have reached your hearts, ladies and gentlemen, have been conveyed to you by the Arab faithfuls. We have never placed Iraq or the Arab Nation above humanity in any thing we said in the past. Nor do we threaten anybody with the qualities of the people of Iraq and the Arab Nation, although the depth of the qualities must be linked with the depth of civilization; qualities such as endurance, patience, resilience to adversity and readiness to fight in the defence of truth.

As he addressed his message to the people of Iraq, Mr. Bush wanted to voice a threat when he talked about the qualities of the people of the United States by saying: "As Americans, . . . there is no Nation on earth with greater resolve or stronger steadiness of purpose." He also placed the American people above other nations when he gave himself the right to lead humankind and all states in his address to the US Congress on 11 September 1990. In this way, Bush is, in fact, promoting a form of neo-Nazism. God is the One and only. He alone is the One Unchallenged Supreme Leader of humankind and the universe. Any claim deviating from this is a false claim void of truth and bound to be repelled.

Glory is not achieved by aggressive force but through justice, fairness, and good example. Humanity would see virtue in the modesty shown by those blessed with power by the Grace of God, the power which God remains capable of taking back, if they fail to show modesty and persist along their path of ignorance.

The glory that comes from power alone can be removed by counter power. It is indeed a glory doomed to oblivion from the moment at which it begins to be built on the basis of aggressive force.

Mr. Bush talked to Congress on 11 September 1990, about the influence of strength and vitality as the two elements of leadership. He made no mention of God and did not speak of wisdom. If man loses the bond between his work and God, he loses his spirit. If he loses wisdom, he will, even if he continues to possess strength and vitality, lose human respect and influence, because he will not be accurate in what he says and does. I do not think that you will disagree with me that whoever loses his soul and the respect of others will lose everything.

Indeed, more important than anything else is the fact that Bush tells you that he brought his armies and the armies of his allies to our region to defend the lifestyle of the American people. Irrespective of the selfish undertones of this statement in which the speaker fails to see the interests of others while pursuing his own, and of the particular danger it carries to humanity as a whole if it were to maintain its generalized dimension, you ought to ask Mr. Bush who, actually, is threatening the lifestyle of the American people? Have the Arabs or Iraqis ever threatened the lifestyle of, the American people? He tells you that he came here to the land of our nation to protect oil and that Iraq should not be allowed to possess 20% of the oil reserves. This makes it incumbent upon you and upon all of us to ask Mr. Bush whether he thinks Iraq intends to sell its oil or to drink it?!

Iraq sells its oil on the usual market in the West. Iraq sells oil to the United States and the West in general. That was the case up to 2 August 1990, when Iraq was selling one third of its oil to the US alone. In any event, if Mr. Bush wanted to issue a new law by which to decide the percentage allowed to any given country of any particular resource or commodity including, the resources of the United States such as grains, then I suggest that Mr. Bush should submit a proposal to that effect to the United Nations. It will then be up to the UN to take a decision which will have to be complied with by all nations and accommodated in the UN Charter.

But if Mr. Bush thinks that he can subjugate humanity and interfere in the details of its life and resources then he is mistaken. This policy on his part is bound to isolate the US from the rest of the world, and make it loathed and despised. It will also cause those who perpetrate this policy to be cursed till the Day of Judgement. I don't wish to burden you with more, but you ought to remember that thousands of children may die of malnutrition due to the lack of children's milk and that the health of many people will deteriorate for lack of adequate food and their life will be in danger.

The blockade on the supplies of food, children's milk and medical needs has been a measure initiated by the US and the Bush Administration in violation of the UN Charter and of international norms.

President Waldheim stated, on his visit to Baghdad on 25 August 1990, that such inhuman action cannot be compared in its impact with any other action regardless of the different descriptions given to it.

This action came from a party to which no threat was posed; while Iraq, in spite of the threats posed to its sovereignty and the security of the nation, did not respond with any measure similar to that action, nor match it in any description, motive, form or shape. Those who talk about foreigners being prevented from travel ought to remember that all the people of Iraq are now prevented from travel and confined to its borders in view of the measures imposed on all means of travel, the last of which being the proposal made by certain parties for the imposition of an air blockade against our civil aviation. Have you ever known or heard about measures as boorish, inhuman and unjust as these measures?

When Bush is asked why he opposed the reunification of Iraq and Kuwait while supporting that of Germany and not objecting to the unity in other parts, he may say to you that he is not against unity but he opposes annexation by force. Without going into details and arguments, you can inform Bush that the Sheikhs of Kuwait were themselves installed by British force. They did not come to rule through democracy or election. Kuwait too had been severed from Iraq by force, and all the attempts for reunification which I have described and which were made through democratic means, including the 1938 attempts of the Legislative Council in Kuwait, were suppressed. The territory of Kuwait, which was severed from Iraq, has been used as a base of conspiracy against Iraq instead of being the part that should support it. There was no other alternative better than what has been done in reuniting the Kuwait part with Iraq, ladies and gentlemen. And we thank God for what has happened.

The claim made by Bush that the majority of the Arabs are with him is inaccurate; I do not want to describe it in other terms. If the desire is there to ascertain the position of the Arab nation, let Mr. Bush agree to the setting up of a working group comprising members of the US Congress to meet with representatives of the people of Iraq from the National Assembly with a view to conducting a joint investigation into, and assessment of, the information and facts relating to the situation.

Mr. Bush has to promise the UN in advance, however, that he will let you know the true facts as they are, in which case you will have known for certain that the Arab Nation stands entirely with Iraq, and that the people of this nation, along with the Moslem of the world, reject the presence of your armies on the land of Moslem sanctities in the Arabian Peninsula. This nation is on the side of truth not falsehood and no one should be deceived by a bunch of mercenaries, weaklings and traitors trembling within the confines of their hiding-places for fear of the people's anger, especially now that they have been isolated from the course of truth pursued by the faithful.

The US administration, ladies and gentlemen, is placing you in a critically embarrassing situation, in addition to the fact that it places you, along with us and the whole of mankind, on the edge of a bottomless abyss. The US administration is causing you embarrassment as Americans in that it keeps talking about and bragging over democracy while allying itself to the most backward of governments; governments which are most unrepresentative of their people, most distant from democracy and most distant from God, the One, the Omnipotent, the Almighty.

The people of Iraq have expressed their view through their demonstrations when they took to the streets in roaring waves protesting what Bush has said in his message to them. They came out immediately after the broadcast of his message in every town.

I have hereby said my word to you on behalf of the leadership in Iraq; indeed on behalf of all true Arabs and Moslem.

God is the source of success. God is great.

There are those who on being told "your enemy had mustered great force against you, fear them, grew more tenacious in their faith and replied 'Allah's Help is all Sufficient for Us. He is the best Protector.'"

Saddaqa Allahu al Adhim (God's is the Word of Truth).

Statement by H.E., Mr. Tariq Aziz
Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq

AS DELIVERED ON HIS BEHALF BY AMBASSADOR ABDUL AMIR AL- ANBARI,
PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF IRAQ TO THE UNITED NATIONS
45TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. President,

NEW YORK, 4 OCTOBER 1990

The present Statement was scheduled to be made before the General Assembly by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of my country. As matters stand, however, he has been prevented from doing so by the position of the American authorities, as explained in the letter dated 23 September 1990 addressed to the Secretary General by my country's Minister of Foreign Affairs and circulated in document S/21812.

As has been the case in past years, we requested the American authorities to permit a special plane, conveying the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the members of the Iraqi Delegation, to land in New York. Those authorities, however, refused to comply with our request and suggested the use of commercial airlines. This could only mean that the United States is, in fact, deliberately preventing the Minister of Foreign Affairs of my country from coming to New York to participate in the proceedings of the General Assembly, present Iraq's point of view on the events and enter into dialogue with representatives of States.

It is to be noted in this regard that, in spite of our contacts with the Secretary General and his contacts with the American Mission on the matter, the Secretariat has done nothing to press the American side to reverse the measures which have prevented the Foreign Minister from participation.

Having made this clarification, I shall now proceed to read the Statement.

Mr. President,

It is a pleasure for me and for my delegation to offer you our congratulations for your election as President of the present session of the General Assembly. In this connection, I should like to assure you of our total willingness and sincere desire to cooperate with you to ensure the success of your task.

The recent events which have taken place in the region have raised and continue to raise a number of vital issues which the international community, and the countries of the third world in particular, need to analyze deeply and derive the right conclusions therefrom. The reason is that these events and the way the United States and its Western Allies have acted in relation to them indicate beyond any doubt that our world is entering a new era. Some would imagine that the prospects this era will open for the peoples of the world, and the peoples of the third world in particular, promise more favorable conditions than those which prevailed in the cold war. The bitter truth, however, is that this new era is the era of the resurgence of Western imperialism under the leadership of the United States, at times with the tacit acquiescence of other great powers and at others with their active participation.

The Western imperialist alliance, under the leadership of the United States, is now conducting a large-scale campaign of disinformation on a global level for which all the capabilities of the American and Western political and informational apparatus -- to say nothing of the military apparatus -- have been pressed into service with a view to misleading the peoples of the world into believing that that alliance, with its benighted history as reflected in the way it deals with the causes of peoples, is today defending international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the so-called international order.

No matter what divergent views may be held on the subject of Kuwait, we must not ignore the vital issues which the United States and its Allies are trying to erase from consciousness and spread disinformation about:

1) The United States and its allies are deliberately and highhandedly obliterating any awareness of the fact that the issue of Kuwait has a history that is rooted in the modern colonialist era when, in 1913, Britain undertook to sever Kuwait from Iraq; of the fact that all the successive governments, both monarchical and republican, which have ruled Iraq over a period of seventy years have refused to accept this colonialist act; and of the fact that this question was the subject of dispute in the Arab League and the United Nations in the sixties. The United States and its Western Allies are deliberately obliterating any awareness of the developments and events which have led to the present situation as well as the fact that, several months before 2 August 1990, they had started a large-scale campaign of conspiracy, defamation and blockade against Iraq and had taken action to put that country under a boycott which included an embargo on exports of foodstuffs to it and further covered scientific and technological fields.

On 4 September 1990, I sent to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the world a letter in which I recounted the history of this question and these developments. I shall therefore refrain from touching on these matters here.

2) These events have taken place in the Arab region - a region which, for many decades, has had its own mechanisms and procedures for dealing with the problems which arise there. The events began on 2 August

1990. On 3 August, His Majesty King Hussein sought to convene in Jedda, on 4 or 5 August, a miniature Summit Meeting to be attended by Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Yemen and Jordan in order to deal with the problem within the framework of the usual Arab mechanisms and procedures. But the party which was supposed to host the meeting, namely, Saudi Arabia, disavowed the meeting after agreeing to having it convened. Two days after the scheduled date of that meeting, American forces landed in the Arabian Peninsula. That makes it clear that it was the United States which put the Arab mechanisms out of action and decided to take control of the political situation itself. One day after its forces had landed in the Arab Peninsula, the United States had its henchmen in the region convene a meeting in Cairo not with the aim of considering and dealing with the question within the mechanisms and procedures by which Arab issues are normally resolved but with a view to obtaining its collaborators' support for the American occupation and American control over the political situation, a matter which led to a sharp division within the ranks of Arab governments. Since then, sincere Arab parties have sought to restore the Arab mechanisms and procedures for dealing with this question, but the United States has suppressed and reviled these attempts; it has threatened the leaders undertaking them and used the Security Council as a tool to frustrate any sincere Arab effort.

3) This fact sheds light on what happened and what continues to happen at the Security Council. On the very first day of the events, the United States had the Security Council convene an emergency meeting and placed before it a resolution based on Chapter VII. For the first time in its history, the Security Council did not allow enough time for the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the State concerned in the issue to be able to participate in its deliberations; nor did the Council provide any opportunity for the participation of any Arab representatives who could make a responsible contribution to those deliberations. America called for the meeting at 4:45 New York time in the morning of 2 August; it submitted a draft resolution and insisted that it be adopted just hours after its submission; then it proceeded to build the subsequent political activity on the basis of that resolution although it well knew that to have a resolution of that kind passed in that hasty fashion would preclude all possibility of a serious and responsible search for suitable solutions to the issue, especially on the Arab side. It is especially regrettable that other international parties have yielded to this line of action which has crippled and continues to cripple a responsible approach to the issue. Resolution 660 is unprecedented in the history of the Security Council whether in terms of the hasty way in which it was passed and discussed or in terms of its direct leap to Chapter VII within the first hours of the occurrence of the events.

4) In a manner which has had no precedent in the history of the United Nations, the United States and its Western Allies had the Security Council pass a series of subsequent resolutions each of which has had the effect of causing further aggravation and escalation of the situation and of blocking the responsible efforts made to seek a solution. In addition to this deliberate political hysteria on their part, the United States and its Allies proceeded, following the events, to mobilize fleets, aircraft and ground forces in the region in a way that has had no parallel in contemporary history, thus bringing the entire region, nay the entire world, to the brink of a devastating war.

5) It is incumbent on us to ask, and ask forcefully on the basis of a review of the events of contemporary history, are the United States and its Western Allies taking this stand to defend international law and the Charter and the just rights of peoples? If the United States and its Western Allies are, as they now claim, such firm upholders of principle, why, then, have all the problems and crises in the world remained unsolved? Why do we come here every year to complain of the continued existence of those problems and crises? To whom have our complaints been addressed? Have they not been addressed to America and its Allies whose actions and policies have been at the root of the problems and crises as well as of the procrastinations in resolving them? Haven't America and its Allies been those who have used the veto to quash the resolutions we would submit to the Security Council, thus providing a cover for the violations committed by their allies in Tel Aviv and Pretoria? Have they not been those who have treated with contempt the resolutions which we would once in a while succeed in having approved by the General Assembly where the third world States have the numerical majority?

Why have the Questions of Palestine, the Middle East and Lebanon remained unsolved until today? What has been the fate of the Security Council resolutions thereon, all 166 of them? Why does Israel continue to occupy Arab territories and have the impudence to declare them part of the "land of Israel"? Why does it call the West Bank Judea and Samaria and declare occupied Al-Quds its eternal capital within sight and hearing of those who have shown such firm resolve to have Security Council resolutions implemented only after the Council has passed its well-known resolutions following the events of 2 August 1990?

The record of the United Nations is full of condemnations of the policy of the United States. We all know the stand taken by the United States and by its Allies, including especially Britain, towards issues of independence, of racial discrimination, of equal economic relations and other issues which every year are presented here in the General Assembly only to be opposed by every possible means by the representatives of America and the West, thus hindering our sincere efforts to have them resolved in accordance with international law, the Charter and the criteria of justice and equity.

The United States has used the veto 81 times to prevent the adoption by the Council of resolutions which, in the majority of cases, dealt with the rights of the Palestinian people, Israeli aggressions against the Palestinian

people and the neighboring Arab States besides resolutions on South Africa. This year alone the United States has used the right of veto seven times to oppose draft resolutions on the Question of Palestine.

Furthermore, the resolutions which the Security Council has adopted on the Question of Palestine, the Middle East and Lebanon and in which it has called for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Palestinian and Arab territories it occupies remain unimplemented to this day, and the same is true of 44 resolutions on Lebanon passed since 1978. Israel continues to occupy South Lebanon since 1982.

The General Assembly, for its part, has adopted over 400 resolutions on the Question of Palestine and the Middle East, the majority of which were opposed by the United States. These resolutions, including especially those which called for enabling the Palestinian people to exercise its inalienable rights, have not been implemented because, alone among the peoples of the world, the Palestinian people is denied recognition of its right to self-determination by the United States and Israel.

To this number must be added the many other resolutions on the rights of the Palestinian people and the Question of the Middle East passed by the Specialized Agencies -- resolutions which Israel has ignored as it has ignored Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, relying on United States opposition to them. We would mention in particular the resolutions adopted by the UNESCO, the International Labour Organization, the World Health Organization and the International Civil Aviation Organization.

We are witnessing in this particular period a new campaign of settler colonialism taking the form of Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries and having for its purpose to perpetuate the Zionist occupation of Palestinian and other Arab territories and establish the so-called greater Israel. The States which are sponsoring this campaign on the pretext of defending human rights and the right to emigrate refuse at the same time to allow the Palestinian people to exercise such rights and the right to return to its homeland in spite of the numerous resolutions in which the United Nations has, since 1948, recognized the right to return but which have remained unimplemented to this day. Now the Zionist emigration operation is being carried out at the expense of this Palestinian right and with a view to forcing what has remained of the Palestinian people to emigrate from their lands.

We Arabs, and we the peoples of the world, must avoid drawing the wrong conclusions. The United States and its Western Allies who are raising such a hue and cry in connection with the recent resolutions which they have imposed in the Security Council are not now passing through a phase of an awakening of conscience; on the contrary, they are pushing the world, in the context of one of the most dangerous and pernicious campaigns of disinformation known to history, into a new imperialistic era. Meanwhile, they are taking advantage of the disruption of the international balance following the events in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to establish this new imperialistic order on a firm basis before the peoples of the world have had the chance to recover from the stunning blow to which they have been subjected and start looking for ways that would enable them to restore the balance in such a manner as to protect their independence and provide for a measure of relations based on justice in the world.

The United States and its Western Allies are not defending international law and the Charter. As the American President George Bush has stated, they are defending the capitalist monetary system of which the investments by the former Kuwaiti regime, amounting to over 200 billion dollars, constitute one of the principal props. They are seeking to gain control over the oil reserves in the Gulf so as to have a free hand in manipulating the needs of the world, and especially the needs of the peoples of the third world, for this important commodity. The United States is seeking, in a dangerously coercive manner, to impose its hegemony over the world, as was disclosed by President George Bush in his speech before the Congress on 11 September 1990 when he said that American objectives in the Gulf are clear, American goals are defined and familiar ... America and the world must defend common vital interests ... and in the pursuit of these goals, the United States will not be intimidated. He emphasized that United States involvement predated the events and will survive them. That is why the United States is raising artificial fears about Iraqi control over 20 per cent of the oil reserves while it was quite happy when those reserves were under the control of a handful of sheikhs. The real reason why such an operation to incite alarm has been undertaken is that although Iraq is an oil-producing country, it considers itself, both in fact and on principle, a third world country which shares the feelings of third world countries, maintains solidarity with them and upholds their causes. In the seventies, before the war with Iran, Iraq had given more than nine billion dollars in aid to various countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

That, then, is the reason: they are fighting against the principle of control by an independent country over its national wealth which has been stolen from it by force and conspiracy in the colonialist era; they are fighting against the investment of that wealth in sound self-reconstruction, and they are fighting so that that independent country may not become an active party in extending disinterested assistance to its brother Arab and third world states as it had done until 1979. When, on 10 September 1990, Iraq announced that it was prepared to supply oil free of charge to third world countries, the United States and its Allies mobilized their political and military apparatus to intimidate those countries so that they may not be able to transport the oil. Now those countries are compelled to pay twice the price they paid just a few weeks ago. On the other hand the United States, which

resisted until a few weeks ago normal and balanced increases in the price of oil in response to supply and demand, is now intent on keeping the price high because it is blackmailing its allies among the oil-producing countries so as to make them spend the earnings resulting from the higher prices to cover the heavy financial costs of its military campaign against Iraq.

6) We must fully ponder over the generosity shown by the United States, the big capitalist countries and the capitalist Arab countries in spending on the military campaign against Iraq. So far, some 20 billion dollars have been raised in the course of a few weeks to spend on this campaign. We must ask: when did these countries ever show just enough generosity to raise a few millions to provide relief to those who are dying of hunger in Africa, to the millions of refugees from the wars in Afghanistan and Cambodia, and to the Palestinian refugees who have been and continue to be expelled by Israel from their own land? When have these countries ever shown such generosity in dealing with the problems of indebtedness which are crushing third world peoples in Latin America, Africa and Asia? When have these countries ever shown generosity in helping countries of the Middle East Region suffering from suffocating economic crises? One such country, which is also among the countries participating in the American campaign, has hundreds of thousands of its citizens living in cemeteries, having lost all hope in finding any kind of housing for themselves.

The United States is not doing all that it is doing now for the sake of the Charter, international law or the rights of peoples. America and its Western Allies are seeking, through this military, political and informational campaign, to gain control over the oil wells and to impose imperialist political, economic and military hegemony over the world, and over third world countries in particular.

Third world countries, therefore, should be on their guard against yielding to the campaign of disinformation being currently conducted by American and Western imperialism. They should be aware of the basic facts in the situation and look after their real interest in what is going on now. Should any of them have their own views on the subject of Kuwait, they would be well-advised to avoid taking positions before ascertaining the true facts and should not confuse their own motives with the ulterior motives of America and its Allies who, by their military occupation of the Gulf and the Arabian Peninsula, are only seeking to provide a cover for their campaign of disinformation and their imperialist aims.

Mr. President,

From all that has just been said, there clearly emerges a basic fact which cannot be ignored, namely, the fact that in the Middle East region, there are issues which are so painful and complex that it would be practically impossible to favour one over another. The whole region is seething with anger and teeming with explosive problems, and such was the case before August 1990. What used to be said from this rostrum by the representatives of the states of the region confirms this fact. Therefore, if the five permanent Members of the Security Council and the Security Council as a whole are really interested in upholding the Charter and international law and in establishing peace and justice in the region, the way to achieve these goals is well-known: on 12 August 1990, President Saddam Hussein proposed that all the issues in the region -- Palestine, Lebanon, the Gulf and others -- be considered on an equal footing; that the Security Council seek to establish common principles and criteria to deal with these issues, and that these principles and criteria be applied to all the issues of the region without ignoring the particularities and antecedents of each. In this way it would be possible in actual fact to establish justice and peace, solve the vexing problems of the region and make the people in the region feel that they can have peace and look forward to a future.

A number of countries have shown interest in these ideas, but America and Britain have sought to suppress any tendency to give them consideration. This indicates bad faith and an unwillingness to deal with the issues of the region on an equitable basis; it even amounts to a confirmation of the insistence on the double standard adopted by the United States and its Allies in dealing with the issues of the region and of the world.

Free countries that truly believe in the Charter and in international law and that are sincerely interested in peace are under obligation to press unrelentingly for a comprehensive and just solution to all the issues of the region.

Thank you.

Interview with Latif Jasim, Culture and Information Minister by unidentified reporter for *Der Spiegel* published on 8 October 1990

[DER SPIEGEL] Mr. Minister, will there be a war?

[Jasim] War may break out at any time. However, this depends on the United States.

[DER SPIEGEL] Why?

[Jasim] Because it is increasingly massing troops in the region. Soldiers are being deployed here under the pretext that we want to attack Saudi Arabia. This is a dirty lie. We have a non-aggression pact with the Saudis. We do not have the slightest reason for attacking Saudi Arabia. After the crisis in Kuwait, King Fahd asked us to participate in a summit meeting of five Arab states. We immediately agreed to this.

[DER SPIEGEL] Why did this meeting not come about?

[Jasim] Because suddenly the Saudis no longer wanted it and called the Americans instead.

[DER SPIEGEL] Do you have an idea what made the Saudis change their mind?

[Jasim] As we now know, the whole thing was a perfidious plot which began long before things happened in Kuwait. It was initiated by the Zionists. Israel realized that it was no longer able to launch a big attack against Iraq on its own. As a result, it ganged up with the scoundrels in Kuwait and other shaikhs in order to start a plot against Iraq. So, we were forced to eliminate the shaikh of Kuwait. However, the plot is still going on and may lead to a war any time, as I just stressed.

[DER SPIEGEL] Let me point out one thing before you continue with your plot theory: There had been no conflict without your attack on Kuwait, and the Americans would not have come to Saudi Arabia either.

[Jasim] This was only a cheap excuse and has nothing to do with the villainy that is going on now. A long time before we invaded Iraq, the United States began an economic siege of Iraq. The entire dirty campaign that was unleashed against us in the United States and Western Europe--with London playing a particularly outstanding role--was already part of the plot. In no time the Americans arrived with their tanks, guns, and other heavy weapons. This proves that everything was carefully prepared a long time in advance. Why are they threatening with a war now, despite the fact that we suggested an Arab solution and are willing to agree to such a solution?

[DER SPIEGEL] But why should the Saudis, without any need, place themselves in such a difficult situation? They are now seen as dubious guardians of the holy sites by the whole Islamic world, who called infidels to help them against their fellow believers. Do you think they would have risked this stigma if they had not felt threatened by Iraq?

[Jasim] The Saudis know quite well that we never threatened them. This is an infamous lie. Why should we threaten or even attack Saudi Arabia?

[DER SPIEGEL] Well, maybe because you wanted more oil.

[Jasim] We do not need more oil. We have enough.

[DER SPIEGEL] Now that you can no longer sell it, you have more than enough. Why should the Saudis maneuver themselves voluntarily into such a tricky situation?

[Jasim] We, too, asked ourselves this question and prepared a detailed analysis. According to our 100 percent correct information, the Saudi Arabian ambassador to Washington, Bandar, played a key role. It was Bandar who, together with the Americans, initiated the whole thing. He also persuaded his uncle, King Fahd, to join the plot, thus exposing him to a great danger. The background to this intrigue is a conflict within the ruling clan. Fahd then dropped his proposal for a summit conference, which was to have provided an Arab solution to the problem of Kuwait. Thus, he would also be responsible for a possible war, which would destroy him as well.

[DER SPIEGEL] Are you prepared for such a war?

[Jasim] We are prepared. Our people's morale is excellent, and we have the best weapons. We have a regular army comprising over 1 million men who have gathered experience in eight years of war. In addition, we have 5.5 million volunteers. If the United States really starts a war here, it will suffer one of its worst defeats in the desert.

[DER SPIEGEL] What makes you so sure of that? After all, the United States is a world power, also in military terms.

[Jasim] Because such a war will quickly develop into a world war. This is an extraordinarily explosive region; a lot of things can burn here. We have the means to set everything on fire or to blow everything up.

[DER SPIEGEL] This may be true. But why a world war? First of all, the United Nations, and thus almost the entire world, is against you.

[Jasim] Once a war breaks out, nobody can say when and how it will end. Oil prices will explode first, to \$200 or \$300 a barrel. How can the world endure this? Who can pay that? Already at this point, when we have not yet fired a single shot, the oil price stands at \$40, which is nearly three times as much as a few months ago.

[DER SPIEGEL] Many countries which do not even think of war are responsible for this.

[Jasim] You may be right. However, can you imagine what will happen when a war starts?

[DER SPIEGEL] Even your Soviet friends have abandoned you. Were you not completely taken by surprise by the strong international reaction to your invasion of Kuwait?

[Jasim] I would like to point out once more that the whole thing was and still is an incredible plot. Imperialism, Zionism, and the whoremonger Kuwait and its helpers conspired against Iraq. The Kuwaitis pushed down our currency to one-fifth the value of their dinar. We had to defend ourselves against this step. At the same time, an opportunity presented itself for correcting history and for finally incorporating Kuwait into our country.

[DER SPIEGEL] At the price of international isolation?

[Jasim] We are by far not as isolated as you think. Those who are against us wanted to suppress us economically before that. However, we can rely on the support of the Islamic masses whose anger against the United States is growing day by day. They are ready to fight with us in a jihad, a holy war. For the first time in Arab history, nationalism and Islam have forged an alliance. You should not deceive yourselves. We are by no means alone.

[DER SPIEGEL] However, most of the Arab states are against you. Many even send troops because they do not like the idea that one Arab state was simply swallowed by its neighbor.

[Jasim] We only implemented our chartered right of 1913. Kuwait always belonged to us. Now we have incorporated it in our country. In addition, we struggle for the unity of all Arabs. You Germans, whom we wholeheartedly congratulate on your unification, should show particular understanding for this.

[DER SPIEGEL] However, Kuwait apparently did not want to be united with you. Do you see no possibility of a compromise, that you withdraw from Kuwait, for example, and keep only the disputed islands and the border region of Rumaylah with its oil fields?

[Jasim] No, never! Never! You can forget about that.

[DER SPIEGEL] We do not want to forget that you are still keeping thousands of foreigners as hostages who have nothing to do with the events. When will you release them?

[Jasim] They are not hostages but guests of the Iraqi people, as our president stated. Unfortunately--but for a noble reason--we were forced to keep them here. They help to prevent the outbreak of a war. We hope that it will soon be possible for them to be reunited with their families in their home countries. We only want the United States to provide a written guarantee that it will not attack Iraq. Then our guests can immediately go home.

[DER SPIEGEL] You always hold others responsible. How do you want to get out of this mess?

[Jasim] We did not start the whole thing. It was the conspirators who want to destroy us.

[DER SPIEGEL] You must live with the consequences resulting from your invasion of Kuwait. A worldwide embargo has been adopted against you. Nobody buys your oil anymore, and nobody supplies goods to you. How long can you endure this?

[Jasim] Of course we are suffering under this embargo. Pharmaceuticals and foodstuffs are becoming scarce. Our children have no milk. This hurts. Nobody denies this. However, we are a big country with two big rivers. We have mobilized our agriculture to make up for the losses.

[DER SPIEGEL] This takes time.

[Jasim] Of course this will take time. We will not be able to harvest tomorrow what we sow today. However, the embargo will not kill us.

[DER SPIEGEL] Abu al-'Abbas and other radical Palestinian leaders conferred with your government. Do you want them to open fronts all over the world in the event of war?

[Jasim] All Arab forces, no matter of what orientation, have their place in Iraq. We do not tell them what they have to do. We do not use terrorist methods. Also, we will not unleash terrorist activities against countries that do not terrorize us.

[DER SPIEGEL] Israel has now started to distribute masks among its population. Must Israel be afraid of Iraqi terrorism?

[Jasim] We will only attack those who attack us. If Israel makes preparations now, this indicates that it wants to attack us. If Israel launches the first strike, we will strike back. We are prepared for it.

[DER SPIEGEL] Do you consider it conceivable that your Arab brothers who supported Iraq in its war against Iran suddenly conspire with Israel and the United States against Iraq? Why should they do that?

[Jasim] Everybody knows that. Nobody wants to or can accept that an Arab country in this clearly divided world should become as powerful as Iraq is now. Everybody hoped that we would be completely destroyed after the war against Iran--economically, socially, politically, and militarily. The opposite was the case. We are stronger today than ever before. However, this is not allowed. No Arab country in this region must be stronger than Israel. Israel must remain the undisputed dominating power. We, who have always claimed that we want to liberate Jerusalem, must be kept weak because they want it this way.

[DER SPIEGEL] Are things as simple as that?

[Jasim] Yes, they are. However, there is also another reason: oil. The United States wants to be in control here. During the Carter era the United States always tried to get access to the oil resources. Only those

who control the most important oil resources can rule the world. In this way, Europe and Japan can easily be blackmailed any time. However, this is not possible as long as there is a powerful Iraq. Thus, they started a plot against Iraq. When Israel no longer succeeded in keeping us small because we had already become too strong, Kuwait assumed the role of the Zionists and pushed the oil price down by overproduction so that we lost billions, which endangered our economy. In this way, the scoundrel Israel wanted to force us on our knees and starve us. The emirates cooperated with Israel.

[DER SPIEGEL] You seem to be obsessed with the idea of the alleged front between the shaikhs, Israel, and the United States. It seems fantastic to us.

[Jasim] Well, this is the truth. The Kuwaitis acted in a particularly stupid way so we decided to kill two flies at the same time: To destroy the plot and to fulfill our historic duty, to incorporate Kuwait in our country.

[DER SPIEGEL] In this way you take the risk that the whole region might explode?

[Jasim] Let me explain the whole bitter truth: If this fire breaks out with an immense force now, the flames will reach the sky and sparks will fly in all directions. Heaps of corpses will be seen in the desert. But this will not be everything. Nobody--nobody, I would like to repeat this--can imagine what explosives will be released, and what will happen in the Islamic world. Will the Americans really be ready to sacrifice their lives if a war should break out? Will the French die for Kuwait? One billion Muslims will fight on our side, and U.S. interests in the Islamic world will be destroyed all of a sudden.

[DER SPIEGEL] You will also be destroyed in such a fire.

[Jasim] In any case, we have the power to cause the destruction of the entire Gulf region in an inferno. You do not have the slightest idea of what we intend to do and what we can blow up virtually everything. We will not do this because we are vandals but because we will defend ourselves with all possible means if we are attacked. We possess means that you do not even dream of. We will not simply be slaughtered.

[DER SPIEGEL] Do you want as many people as possible to die with you?

[Jasim] We will not die. The others will die.

Message on "Iraqi Child Day" from Saddam Hussein on 12 October 1990

In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate:

Our message today goes out to the children, even if on this occasion we are also addressing ourselves to adult minds. As we celebrate the day of the Iraqi child, we also observe the day of the children of Arabism and the children of the world, and not least the children of dear Palestine--the heroes of the stones, every one of whom is acting like a hero of our nation taking on injustice and Satan in the same camp as their fathers and their patient mujahidin brothers.

When, on this day, we ponder the great significance of this particular day being named as day of the child, we must recall all the humanitarian principles, without which we do not believe man can become free or happiness prevail in human society. In this year, the invocation of the means to bring about the happiness of children will be fraught with all the dangers inherent in the economic blockade and the threat of military force by imperialism and invader armies. It is significant in the uniqueness of these circumstances and their implications.

A few days ago, specifically on 3 October 1990, the whole world observed the international day of the child. The observance was attended, and speeches were made by anyone who could be there. Some of them proposed partial solutions to childhood conditions, just as they used to propose partial solutions to issues bearing on key issues of human society. Typical of those responsible for human tragedies when they distance themselves from universality, and thus distance themselves from the right thinking and the right remedy, they sought to divorce the question of childhood from the subject of life. For us, however, it is inconceivable that a happy childhood can be attained without happy lives for their adult fathers, mothers, and relatives.

In that international gathering, some speakers argued that to eliminate starvation of children in the world, they would need several billion dollars. It is natural that the rich and those responsible for the travails of humanity should find it virtually impossible to admit that this human goal is achievable and that this sum can be made available for that noble objective. We see clearly that there is an inseparable link between children's happiness and the communities in which they live. We submit that there can be no freedom for the children without pure milk and pure clothing of a chaste mother. Such conditions are impossible to obtain in circumstances of hunger and want, or where the allurements of affluence in a community sated in all its wants cause the envy of a community yearning for all that it wants and needs.

We find that true happiness cannot be divorced from a sense of dignity, and that decent bread is only possible when it is mixed in dignity. A child will only be free in a free community. A child cannot be born free in a family enslaved by shackles of others, for in time, it is bound to become similarly enslaved.

Children of the world become free and healthy when all the adults of the world become free and possess what it takes to be healthy. The children of the world can have no secure future except under circumstances of

equality. The children of any society cannot be free except when their societies have equal opportunities with other societies and enjoy their freedom equally. In a world dominated by the rich whose humanity is eaten up by greed, the wealth of these rich can only spawn destitution causing hunger and disease.

A child whose parents are enslaved by denial of equal opportunities and livelihood, and whose mother's milk is soiled with vice, cannot but be enslaved itself. And its sense of enslavement will haunt it, even if in adulthood, he manages to free himself of the shackles of material slavery.

The big difference in the level of scientific and technological progress and economic development among societies will always effect the type of outlook and conduct that will give rise to a feeling of superiority in these fields and a kind of superior outlook and conduct on the part of the society of tyrants over societies that are less developed. All this will produce suffering afflicting the present and future of children, after having afflicted their parents, and causing them to lose their ability to deal properly with life.

Wherever there is a difference in the opportunity to choose, a difference in freedom and liberation will result. Consequently, the difference in freedom at the expense of others will distance those who enjoy freedom without limit from God and from those who are deprived of freedom and its requirements without having any imminent hope. For, possessing absolute freedom of action over the destiny of other humans will keep those who practice this approach at a distance from God, just as those who are able to achieve all their wishes and whims are distanced from God. This applies to those who possess wealth that is not limited by law or morality in an impoverished society. It also applies to those who are capable and who use their capabilities negatively in weak societies.

We view national society as one society; the pan-Arab society as one; and the world as one human society. There is no room for discrimination, which creates differences in human dealings on any religious, ethnic or other basis, to prevail in these societies.

It is on the grounds of misunderstanding of the above which is detailed in all religions, primarily the true Islamic religion—that the children in Africa and in other places have remained hungry and enslaved and died because of hunger. This is not because food and medicine are not provided by human organizations the way they should be, or because they have not provided them at all, but because the proper living conditions have not been made available to their fathers and mothers as they should be. And, if the adults are not provided with the proper living conditions, a living cannot be provided for the children.

Consequently, if anyone wants to help children there, he should help adults as well, in terms of job opportunities and sound living. The decisions adopted by human societies should be replaced, or, other decisions issued by political leaders should be concomitant with the former. Moreover, the required funds should be spent on development projects, and not just on projects to provide food and medicine for children. This is because, if poverty remains, it will produce a continuing lack in children's milk and medicine. Happiness will never be achieved if poverty continues.

Some of those who attended the celebration of the international day of the child and who delivered high-sounding speeches, including Bush, have spent more than \$20 billion on the armies of invasion and other armies that came to the land of Najd and Hejaz [Saudi Arabia] and the Arabian Gulf. Specialized human organizations and societies have not been able to provide this sum for children who are dying of hunger or of disease because medicine is either scarce or not available at all.

Those who are shedding crocodile tears, on the international day of the child, over the future of children that are dying in the world are the same ones, they and their regimes, who are responsible for those tragedies, and we hold them responsible today for the tragedy of any Iraqi child that dies because of a shortage of food or medicine caused by their unjust blockade. They and their regimes are responsible for all this. Also, they are responsible for all the tragedies of wars and civil wars in the world, be it directly or because of their intrigues and conspiracies. Therefore, they alone are responsible not only for the tragedy of the Palestinian people and the Zionists' oppression of them in general, but also for the persecution and crimes against the children of Palestine in particular.

Those who believe that everything in the lives of others can be bought are true to their nature because they themselves put up everything in their lives for sale. This had been their feelings and behavior in their relations with Iraq before 2 August. Therefore, the Croesus of Kuwait and his henchmen were dragged into their schemes after their vision and hearts were blinded by the wealth that had been stolen from the great Iraqi people. They believed, curse them, that they were able, through their usurpation and wealth, to tamper with the values of the Iraqis and with the sacred virtues in which they believed. They thought they could not only enslave and corrupt the lives of adults but also enslave children in pursuit of their despicable aims.

The duty toward God and the national and noble pan-Arab and human duty compelled us to carry out what overcame the Croesuses on 2 August, the victorious day of the call. Thus, not only were Iraqi men and women able to remain free, but a great opportunity was made for a freedom whose waves are expanding, God willing, across the Arab homeland and the entire world.

My beloved children of Iraq. I am aware that you love sweets, despite the harm they cause to your beautiful teeth. Many of you, especially the very young, live on imported milk, and the quantity of this milk available in Iraq has been reduced because of the blockade that Bush has imposed. He is abetted in his crime by Zionism and its creation, Israel, which usurped the Palestinian land. I and your comrades in the leadership feel with you, and we are living through what some of you are suffering. We will do what determined and valiant men should do whose conscience is filled with responsibility. Our aim is to alleviate your suffering to the best of our ability, as God wishes us to do. However, the shortage or unavailability of sweets is less harmful compared to what Bush wants. Bush wants to enslave you after enslaving your fathers and mothers. Shame on him and shame on those who stand behind him with bowed heads and shameless faces. Bush wants to take control of your present and that of your families so that he can dominate your future in order to satisfy Zionism, evil Israel, and imperialist ambitions.

Therefore, your fathers have proudly rejected Bush's wishes and preferred what God wants for every free people, so that you might remain proud, O beloved ones. Abundance, sweets along with pride, a decent present, and a bright future are all coming with the steadfastness of your fathers and mothers. Honor will remain protected and safe, God willing.

Children are the beloved of God. They are our beloved from all nationalities, races, and religions, be they in Iraq, Palestine, and the Arab homeland, or all over the face of the globe.

God is great. Ignominy to those who kill childhood and life and alienate themselves from God, the One and Only One.

[signed] Saddam Hussein, 12 October 1990

Interview with Dr. Sa'dun Hammadi, Revolution Command Council member, Deputy Prime Minister, and Chair of the Economic Committee, by Sabah Nahi on 13 October 1990

[Nahi] This interview is taking place under the siege imposed on Iraq. So, we have to start the dialogue from this point: How can our people confront the current economic blockade, especially if it lasts a long time, and is there any new concept of how the blockade should be confronted on the local, Arab, and international levels?

[Hammadi] The first thing I would like to say is that any talk that Iraq has not been harmed by the blockade is untrue. Such talk would be unreasonable. In fact, we have been harmed by the blockade. However, what should be stressed is that the responsibility for the damage afflicting Iraq lies with the United States and its Western allies. The blockade is designed to halt the development process, and halting development in a country that believes in scientific development is a big issue, because it is related to the standard of living and the future of the Iraqi masses. Therefore, the United States and its Western allies are responsible for that severe damage inflicted on our national economy. It is clear that this act breaches the UN Charter and conflicts with the aims of Third World development. What the United States is doing through the United Nations is an act against the spirit and the letter of the Charter. In addition to halting development, the human services we provide to our people, such as education, teaching, and industry, will also be harmed, and they are actually harmed as a result of the economic blockade. The best evidence is that public health and the health of children in particular are exposed to the dangers of diseases, malnutrition, and a shortage of education and teaching. The United States and its Western allies are responsible, and every party that yielded to pressure and personal interests and participated in this campaign is also morally and ethically responsible for the damage inflicted on us. However, we cannot surrender, out of self-defense, to such damage. In fact, we have to resist. Comprehensive resistance should begin to minimize the effects of the damage through self-reliance, maximizing agricultural production, and providing for needs through local resources. The United States and its allies and every party that responded to that are responsible for the damage inflicted on our national economy and the life of our people. The reaction will be resistance rather than surrender. Large-scale agricultural development will minimize the damage. Through determination, effort, and persistence, we will succeed.

[Nahi] What are the prospects for development at this stage, and has Iraq halted its development plan under the pressure of the crisis?

[Hammadi] Development at this stage is development of self-defense. This means provision of food and other basic needs on the civilian side of the issue, and meeting the needs of defense and the Armed Forces, on the military side, in the best way possible. Therefore, all development efforts at this stage have been readjusted and reorganized on this basis. Undoubtedly, this does not mean halting the long-term development process, which is not directly linked with the goals I have mentioned. This is an exceptional situation, but we are obliged to deal with it. There are many differences between this development plan and the other plans under ordinary circumstances.

[Nahi] Numerous measures have been taken to activate the agricultural sector, since it is at the core of Iraq's ability to hold fast at the current stage. How do you assess the agricultural sector's response to the

measures that have been adopted, especially for the next winter season? Can we say that there is a possibility for achieving a certain level of self-sufficiency in basic, strategic crops?

[Hammadi] All signs indicate that there is a large-scale response to the current development efforts in the agricultural sector. There have been two reasons for this success. The first is that financial incentives for increasing production have been provided, such as increasing the prices of basic crops. Other financial incentives include reducing the prices of seeds, fertilizer, and everything related to agricultural mechanization. In addition, administrative restrictions curbing the private sector's ability to increase production have been removed. We have taken major steps in this field within a short period of time. Moreover, there is the national enthusiasm factor, which is very important, because it is related to the morale of the peasants and all those who work in agriculture. We make use of both individual and national incentives, because we believe that both factors should be made available to achieve the highest increase in production. All signs so far indicate that there is a large-scale response among workers in the agricultural sector. Therefore, we expect a great response and success in the achievement of the aspired objectives.

The core of these objectives is the achievement of self-sufficiency in cereals as a minimum requirement. Some say we are going beyond this objective, and that agriculture will expand not with regard to cereals only, but also other products. All this is possible and will be clear within the next period. However, what we are sure of now is that there is a large-scale and voluntary response by the peasants to increase the cultivated area and, consequently, production.

I will not discuss here the measures that have been adopted, since they are known and have been declared. These measures are numerous and are aimed at achieving these objectives. These measures cover prices, ways of using the state-owned lands, and the lifting of the administrative and legal restrictions on the agricultural sector. I must remark here that we are trying to encourage creativity among agricultural specialists in the invention of new methods and production techniques to help replace imported materials with local ones. For example, good progress has been achieved in the field making new fodder for livestock using basic materials based on non-cereal local products not needed for human consumption. We are about to develop an alternative to this basic material. There have been numerous suggestions, some of which will be useful for achieving such purposes.

[Nahi] Some say that in the next season, Iraq will be able to export an agricultural surplus. What do you think?

[Hammadi] This is possible. If this takes place, we will not export before the end of the crisis. Iraq will maintain every human foodstuff to defend itself. It is possible that production may exceed local needs.

[Nahi] There have been reports on offers by industrial and commercial companies to supply Iraq with medicines and foodstuffs through a third party. How true are these reports?

[Hammadi] This is not true. As far as intentions are concerned, I am sure that most companies and commercial individual and collective establishments are willing to break the embargo and to continue profitable businesses. However, these establishments are currently subject to pressure by their governments, which are also subject to pressure by the United States and its Western allies. As for intentions, yes, there are strong intentions, but I think the implementation of these wishes is not possible for the reasons I mentioned. We are working on the basis of self-reliance only. Our plan takes into consideration no materials from abroad.

[Nahi] Leader President Saddam Hussein has repeatedly proposed the establishment of an international fund to help developing countries that were hurt by increasing oil prices. He also put forward initiatives concerning high inflation rates in the capitalist countries, and other issues. Are current circumstances appropriate for such initiatives? And what was the response to them?

[Hammadi] When the president makes proposals, he means that Iraq must certainly be a main contributor, he does not mean that others should implement the proposals while Iraq stays aloof. Therefore, I naturally believe that the president wants his proposals to be implemented when Iraq is experiencing a normal situation, not the current extraordinary situation. I expect that after the crisis has been resolved, Iraq will play more active role in consolidating the various Arab funds by increasing their capital and facilitating their activity. The oil-producing countries will increase their financial assistance to poor Arab countries with a view to achieving radical transformation in the process of Arab wealth distribution. The poor Arab countries have rights to the oil wealth, which is centered in certain Arab countries merely by geographic coincidence. After the unification of Kuwait and Iraq, the latter's financial capability has increased, and out of its principles, Iraq is expected to play a more active role in this regard.

[Nahi] Iraq put forward a positive and humanitarian initiative when it proposed supplying the needy developing countries with free Iraqi oil. How many requests have you received? And how can this proposal be implemented to the advantage of the developing world?

[Hammadi] Here, there is also a difference between the desire and the realization of this desire. I strongly believe that perhaps all Third World countries, and even other countries not belonging to the Third World, would have liked to benefit from this initiative if they had the freedom to do so. The Third World countries and world

nations in general believe that Iraq is serious in its offer, and it means what it says. All world nations are willing to benefit from the initiative, but they are unable to because of the current circumstances.

Immediately after the initiative was made, the United States said through its administration officials that the oil embargo includes this free oil, which meant that no country could benefit and ensure the safe arrival of Iraqi oil or any other Iraqi product.

[Nahi] The Saudi regime has taken measures to punish the fraternal Arab countries that opposed the U.S. invasion of the Arab lands. Particularly, it cut off oil to these countries. How do you view this? And are there any Iraqi measures to provide urgent assistance to these countries?

[Hammadi] First, this is an old and regrettable story. Whenever a political dispute emerges between an Arab government and another, each government tries to punish the citizens of the other, cut off human and popular bonds, and abrogate earlier agreements. This has had very negative effects on inter-Arab relations and has significantly hindered Arab interaction. Such conduct shows weak or lacking pan-Arab feelings and reflects a primitive, uncivilized spirit. The Saudi Government's measures against Jordan and Yemen are a concrete example on this. Iraq is now going all-out to lessen the economic and financial burden on Jordan and Yemen as a result of the Saudi position. It approved cooperation, especially with Jordan, to avoid any oil shortage resulting from the cutoff of Saudi oil. I think that the measures taken are successful and can solve the problem. We are also trying to take other measures to ease the damage resulting from such actions against Jordan, Yemen, and any other Arab country in a similar position.

[Nahi] French-Iraqi relations were strongly shaken when the French Government got carried away and followed the U.S. position. Will this have any impact on the distinguished French-Iraqi ties? Will it also affect the status of French companies?

[Hammadi] France and Iraq are bound by strong ties which have been formed throughout a long period of time. We have made it clear time and again to the French side that we are eager to maintain these ties and promote them, and that we are ready to strengthen these relations in the future. This position has taken shape following the termination of the war with Iran, and through many measures. The re-scheduling agreement which we signed with France was better than any similar agreements which were concluded with other countries. Moreover, we encouraged the activity of French companies in Iraq, and all pending economic problems between the two countries were resolved. Things got out of hand, however, and all this has come to a halt as a result of France's contribution to the economic embargo against Iraq. Many French quarters wished this had not happened.

Here, I would like to note that the positions of France during this crisis have been far from identical with those of the United States. We have always been concerned to make France understand that this is not in its interest in the region, and it has been proven that the status France has in Iraq and the Arab countries following the independence of Algeria, and since the age of President de Gaulle, has turned out to reflect a sound policy which deserves to be heeded. Here, I would like to point out that the French position has recently shown some moderation represented in the proposals of the French president, which he declared in his speech to the General Assembly. We have explained to the French side that these proposals are worthy of attention and development. At any rate, and regardless of what has taken place, we are eager to maintain ties with France, but it depends on the French side to confirm this.

[Nahi] The position taken by some official Soviet sides at international forums has revealed an unmistakable change which runs counter to the existing ties of friendship between Iraq and the USSR. To what extent does this reflect on the nature and magnitude of cooperation between Iraq and the USSR, which has been characterized throughout previous decades by stability and mutual trust?

[Hammadi] In the case of the USSR, it is well known that Iraq and the USSR are bound by long-standing, solid relations. These relations have been useful to Iraq and the USSR, both materially and morally. The USSR and Iraq are bound by a long-term friendship agreement. The radical change that has overtaken Soviet policy toward the Western camp, especially the United States, has led the USSR to take positions identical to those of the United States in relation to the Security Council resolutions. It is clear that this position is not in harmony with the spirit of the Iraq-USSR friendship agreement. I can say that in this regard we have shown patience and tolerance, and have been eager to explain to the USSR that these positions harm relations between the two countries and are incompatible with the spirit of the friendship agreement.

To tell the truth, I would say that the USSR, for its part, has expressed its eagerness to maintain friendly relations with Iraq. However, it depends on the USSR in the next stage whether it is eager to maintain relations with us or whether it has other considerations.

[Nahi] How accurate is it to say that this is the era of American hegemony of the world?

[Hammadi] It is still early days. The emergence of other powers to counterbalance the United States is not a farfetched possibility. Monopoly and tyranny cannot reign forever.

[Nahi] Would you name some of these powers?

[Hammadi] Western Europe, for one, can act as a new center of gravity, and so can Japan. The same goes for Arab countries pursuing unity and liberation.

[Nahi] Iraq is said to be seeking a deal to swap oil for foodstuffs and medicines via Iran. How accurate is the report?

[Hammadi] No, no such contacts are taking place. It is absolutely groundless. The contacts under way between Iraq and Iran are on the POW's and normalization of ties and to seal the end of the war that, for all intents and purposes, halted on 8 August 1988.

[Nahi] Incidentally, what is the latest on the POWS?

[Hammadi] Yesterday the Iraqi delegate traveled to Iran and communicated to the Iranians that we initiated the prisoner release on the strength of numerous promises by them that the prisoner swap would be full and comprehensive. We kept our part of the deal, having set free all the Iranian prisoners. The Iranians released a corresponding number. Given that Iraqi prisoners outnumber the Iranians, the Iranians unjustifiably halted the releases. It is not true that there are Iranian prisoners left in Iraq. We are now seeking, through dialogue, to let the Iranian side honor their promises they gave relevant to the prisoners.

[Nahi] Are you optimistic all these crises, above all the blockade, will come to an end?

[Hammadi] A blockade cannot last forever--nothing does. But I cannot pin it to a time frame. It is hard to predict, but certainly it will take some time yet. It may be days or weeks before the blockade ends. This will happen when those who initiated the embargo come to the realization that it is doing them more harm than good.

Interview with Saddam Hussein by Kentaro Hirayama and Masayoshi Terauchi, reporters for NHK Television Network on 20 October 1990

[Hirayama] In connection with the Middle East situation, many people are concerned about the possibility of an outbreak of war, and they are seeking some sort of political measures to settle the crisis. The Iraqi Government has indicated a positive attitude toward a peace proposal made by French President Mitterrand. Why has the Iraqi Government indicated such a attitude?

[Hussein] We are a member of the world and brethren of it. The uneasiness of the people of the world is our uneasiness. What the people are concerned about most is the outbreak of war. All people hope for peace. We are also praying very hard for peace. We have no intention of rejecting dialogue. We are not especially annoyed with regard to various issues involving mutual interests, even if some people hold views different from ours. What is difficult for us is the fact that people who have hostile feelings toward us are indicating a partial view, with preconceptions. We did not have any prior knowledge of President Mitterrand's peace proposal before it was announced. As a leader of a Western nation, a nation that is a member of the UN Security Council, he truly wants to avoid war and looks for measures to settle the crisis peacefully. We have responded positively to President Mitterrand's stance.

[Hirayama] What points do you especially like in the four-pronged peace proposal?

[Hussein] I like a few points in the proposal. I think that among other things, the serious attitude of looking for measures to avoid war deserves appraisal.

[Hirayama] Could you be more specific?

[Hussein] If a way for dialogue is opened, this will naturally yield forward-looking results. Mutual relations will be improved through continuation and repetition of dialogue. Humans can reason. Humans do not spare any efforts to prevent war.

A human being only looks at things from his own standpoint. To be sure, it is possible for people to persist in their positions and express completely different views. In that case, however, we have never refused to listen to such different views. We made a proposal aimed at bringing peace not to a part of the Middle East, but to the entire region. We made this proposal on 12 August. We made this proposal, taking into account the existence of different views.

However, no dialogue has been held. Conditions should be created for holding genuine dialogue. For people who either want war or want peace, it is important to discern who is earnestly seeking dialogue. Rejecting dialogue leads to war, while holding dialogue leads to peace.

[Hirayama] Your Excellency, I think it is necessary for conflicting parties to make concessions to each other to realize dialogue and political solutions.

[Hussein] Among other things, it is important to seek a meeting point for a political solution. If we fail to find the meeting point, we will be unable to realize any political solution. We have tried to resolve not only individual issues in the Middle East, but all issues in the region. Some people are seeking a venue for dialogue only to settle the crisis set off on 2 August. However, many issues in the Middle East that existed before 2 August remain unresolved. As you are aware, the Palestinian issue arose in 1947, and since that time, the issue has remained unresolved. There are other unresolved issues in the region. Oil revenues have made some people rich, and this has become an issue.

[Hirayama] Mr. President, are you ready to enter into political dialogue to settle the crisis, even with the presence of multinational forces in the region?

[Hussein] I have stated that it is important to create a climate suitable for dialogue. We are trying to resolve present issues in the region through dialogue, not force. However, the presence of a superpower's foreign troops in the region is totally harmful for holding a dialogue. Therefore, it is necessary to eliminate all the pretexts to justify the deployment of foreign troops in the region. We are ready to give Saudi Arabia a guarantee that we will not take any hostile actions. If we do so, this will naturally eliminate the pretext justifying the stationing of foreign troops in Saudi Arabia.

[Hirayama] Iraq is governing Kuwait after dividing it into two administrative parts. In other words, Iraq has annexed the northern part of Kuwait and two islands into al-Basrah Province. Iraq has designated the rest of Kuwait as its 19th province. There is speculation that Iraq may restore Kuwait's sovereignty with some conditions attached.

[Hussein] Now, the whole of Kuwait is part of Iraq. We are not present now in only one part of the province of Kuwait in a manner that may justify such an administrative separation or division. How to govern Kuwait is a matter for us to decide. Before the latest situation developed, we had changed the boundary lines of provinces. This is the same thing.

Britain forcibly divided Kuwait, which was originally part of Iraq. The grandson of the Kuwaiti provincial governor at the time of division served as the amir of Kuwait up to 2 August of this year. Kuwait was part of al-Basrah Province before the division. We have held dialogue with a new government that was established in August of this year. The new government expressed its desire and hope to be annexed to al-Basrah Province as it was. It also expressed its desire to settle the boundary as it was. However, the Iraqi Government has created the Kasim Province and planned to call Kuwait City "Kasim City." Regarding whether to call Kuwait Kasim Province or al-Basrah Province, this is a matter for Iraq to decide, since Kuwait is part of Iraq. If Iraq intended to annex part of Kuwait, we would not have done this thing.

[Terauchi] You have mentioned the Palestinian issue as one of the most important factors. If Israel withdraws from the West Bank and Gaza, are you ready also to withdraw from Kuwait?

[Hussein] It is not appropriate for a leader of a nation to answer hypothetical questions posed by the mass media. If I answer your question, what will it give us? If you want to ask me to answer the question, you must first draw forth from Israel a declaration of withdrawal.

[Hirayama] Do you still support the political platform of the PLO adopted two years ago, that is, a two-state solution for Palestine-one Israel and one Palestine? Do you still support the idea?

[Hussein] Whenever the PLO may express its position, it represents the view of the Palestinians. Even if it may differ from our view, we would not oppose it. We are calling for the creation of an environment fit for humankind to live in. We are calling for the realization of this not only for our own country, but also for all the Arabs, all nations, and all generations.

I will answer your question directly when Israel has recognized the founding of a Palestinian state on Palestinian territory.

[Hirayama] You once advocated disarming the Middle East in general, including your chemical weapons and Israeli nuclear armaments. Does that proposal still stand?

[Hussein] Yes, it still stands. Because of the latest situation, the importance of that proposal has been heightened. If a partial solution is tried, it may exercise a destructive influence with regard to other questions. That is why we are calling for a complete and comprehensive solution. In other words, we, the Iraqis, are proposing ridding the entire Middle East region, where Israel exists, of weapons of mass destruction.

[Terauchi] How do you assess the United Nations and its Charter?

[Hussein] Of course, I set store by the UN Charter. For that reason, we affixed our signature, too. But it is necessary to distinguish between the spirit stipulated in the Charter and actual actions taken by member countries thus far. There is something that runs counter to the spirit of the Charter in actions by some permanent members of the UN Security Council. This has become more plain this time.

[Hirayama] My question concerns your concept of the world situation after the end of the cold war. How do you assess the world situation after the end of the cold war and new cooperation between the Americans and Russians to create a new world order?

[Hussein] To extinguish the fires of war is in the interest of mankind, be it in the East or the West. This holds true for the Arab countries as well as for all other countries of the world. From this viewpoint, we find the development of U.S.-Soviet relations satisfactory. The elimination of the possibility of war between the two countries is a very good thing. But we have something which we must speak about here. Although we have no intention of criticizing the Soviets, the Soviet Union has changed its earlier posture. We are very much concerned with the behavior of the United States, which is applying pressure on the Soviet Union from behind the scenes. The United States is trying to force upon the Soviet Union a position that is totally opposite to justice in human society. We hope that the danger of war will disappear, but the attitude of the United States is unilateral and set.

We are calling on all countries of the world so that a new force will emerge that can counter the absolute force of the United States. We are waiting for forces to counter the United States to be spawned in all parts of the world. By force I do not mean military force. There should be various means to counter the United States. With these forces, we must apply the brakes on unilateral imposition by the United States. For when the United States becomes uncontrollable, it may lead the world to destruction. An armed force that has lost control will start a war. What is happening in the Persian Gulf today attests to this. Using a trivial matter as a pretext, the United States can attack Iraq at any time. Should a war be started, I think that the scale of the war would be beyond anyone's imagination. Neither the extent nor the results of the war would be measurable, I think.

[Hirayama] You look to be confronting superpowers, especially the United States, as a champion of the Third World. But as a result of the triggering of this crisis, the party that is suffering most seems to be the Third World--like people from the Philippines and Bangladesh losing jobs in Kuwait and Iraq and going home, et cetera. Don't you feel some dilemma?

[Hussein] From the humanitarian viewpoint, my heart aches over their situation. But I want to ask, in turn: What situation were they in before this crisis? The living conditions of the people of the Third World are deteriorating with the passage of each day. What is the cause? A force that thinks of nothing but its own interests, at the sacrifice of others, is creating problems in the Third World countries. Don't you think it is the United States that is causing the misfortunes of the Third World today? Therefore, if we desire peace, we must bring about the freedom of the Third World first. To bring about that freedom, we must provide food to the poor people. At the same time, it is necessary to respect their honor, too. I think that by doing this, the foundation for peace will be laid in the Third World and throughout the world.

Peace on the part of the United States and the Soviet Union was possible because a balance of forces was kept between the two sides. But once this balance is broken, disputes will start all over the world, bringing severe damage. The presence of a unilateral force, which tries to dictate to others as it pleases, is the cause of all problems. We are deeply concerned about the influence the latest situation exercised over the Third World. Please bring to mind two statements made by Iraq.

First, Iraq announced that it would provide oil to the Third World countries free of charge. It is currently impossible to sale oil at market prices to the Third World countries. Therefore, we announced that we are ready to export oil to these countries free of charge.

The other announcement was addressed to the advanced nations. It said that we are ready to export oil to advanced nations at OPEC prices. Under U.S. pressure, the UN Security Council resolved to impose economic sanctions. Among the advanced nations are some that say they cannot import Iraqi oil after all even if they want to because they cannot pay the prices directly due to the restrictions resulting from the economic sanctions. To these countries, we said we will wait for their payments until the dispute has been resolved. I have heard that in the wake of this announcement by Iraq, the price of oil has decreased by \$3.00.

You may be thinking that Iraq had no choice but to make an announcement of such actions because it can no longer withstand the pressure of the economic blockade. But Iraq made an announcement of a similar nature at a summit of non-aligned nations held in Havana in 1979. Actually, as a result of our action, India was able to import oil at cheap prices. India was able to save more than \$100 million as a result of the measure.

[Terauchi] What do you see as the future prospects of the Arab world, as a leader of it?

[Hussein] We expect its future to be better than the present. We are optimistic that Arab nations will achieve the progress befitting them. As they have done in the course of a long history, I believe that the Arab nations will continue to play humanitarian and constructive roles henceforth.

[Hirayama] As for GCC [Gulf Cooperation Council] countries, do you accept the status quo, except for Kuwait?

[Hussein] We regard the status quo of the Gulf countries positively. They are all countries that can be considered brothers. Iraq has done its best to have friendly relations with these nations. We have been pushing for cooperative relationships with GCC countries. It is Iraq that has protected these nations from aggression by other countries. Hence, we have no intention of changing our relations with the GCC countries, nor have we any objection to various cooperative relationships being undertaken by these Arab nations.

[Terauchi] So there will be no dominoes falling one by one, after Kuwait?

[Hussein] The countries other than Kuwait have never been a part of Iraq in the past, and Iraq has never been a part of any other country.

[Hirayama] What concrete measures do you expect from Japan? And at the same time, how do you assess the Japanese Government's stance thus far concerning this crisis?

[Hussein] We expected that Japan would assume a stance different from that of the United States. We hope that Japan's stance will be different hereafter. This is because if the United States puts the Middle East under its control and comes to control the volume and pricing of oil exported to Japan, that indeed will be against the interests of Japan. Even among the Arab nations there are some that are friendly toward the United States. But

the countries that bring benefits to Japan are not those countries, but rather such countries as Iraq. Apparently, there are some countries that make illogical choices.

[Terauchi] So, under what circumstances would you be willing to release all foreign detainees, including Japanese?

[Hussein] First of all, threats against Iraq must cease. Only when a tendency toward war has been eliminated can there be dialogue and peace. For instance, let's take Japan. Japan has not dispatched its forces to the region as yet, as the United States has done. But what has Japan done? Japan has provided \$4 billion. From our viewpoint, Japan has provided \$2 billion in military support and \$2 billion in economic assistance. This is nothing but an act of hostility against Iraq. What is facilitating the stationing of the U.S. forces in Saudi Arabia? It is monetary support from Japan and other countries, is it not? Japan also announced it will send troops without arms, and then, more recently, it has said it will send them with arms. We, the Arabs, still desire friendly relations with Japan. But it escapes my understanding why Japan is taking actions that are not beneficial to itself. I cannot understand why decisions are being made for actions that bring no benefits to its people, numbering more than 100 million. The only interpretation is that Japan is being pressured into doing this by the United States. Japan has economic power and its own unique culture and also a long history.

[Hirayama] Apart from this crisis, and looking to the long future ahead, what do you expect from Japan with regard to Iraq and, subsequently, the region?

[Hussein] I hope that Japan will stand on the side of the Arab world. The Arab world will have to build up close relations of friendship with Japan in the future. Japan is an Asian country and there is no reason why the Arab countries should become irritated by Japan. Between the nations of Europe and America and the nations of the Arab world, there is a history of the former having been rulers and the latter the ruled. With Japan there is no such history. But as long as Japan pursues a policy of following in the footsteps of the United States, we will look on Japan as being the same as one of the European-American nations. Japan's future interests lie in the true friendship between Japan and the Arab countries. For this to be realized, it is important that both sides impose no preconditions on each other. Historically, the Arab nations' feelings toward Japan have been good. The Japanese are always welcome as friends in the Arab world. I hope that the Japanese will value the fact that the Arab nations are looking on Japan from a positive viewpoint.

Bush is now playing a useless intelligence game. Intelligence operations are Bush's specialty. Bush is trying to make the countries friendly with the Arab nations turn against them. He wants to disrupt friendly relations within the Arab countries. Bush is spreading various false rumors to Saudi Arabian leaders and President Mubarak about Iraq's intentions regarding Saudi Arabia. The fellow, who is thoughtless and also witless, is trying with his intelligence manipulations to drag in the European countries. He is doing the same thing with Japan. He is using the old tactics. I know what Bush is doing with Japan. What he wants is for the world to be as he designs it.

[Hirayama] Finally, about yourself. You are very often regarded by Iraqi and Arab media as a new Saladin [laughter], or a new Al-Nasir. How do you describe yourself? In other words, who do you respect most among historical Arab or international leaders?

[Hussein] All leaders in the world should serve national liberation and make decisions without fearing anyone but God. Only those who can do so, can command the respect of people. I particularly respect Arab leaders. I think that Saladin, who repelled the crusaders, or Egyptian President Nasir was one of them. I am trying to learn and follow all that is positive in the context of the leaders in the Arab world and the world at large. But we know that every leader lives in his own time. He makes efforts desperately and he behaves according to his own temptations. I am Saddam Hussein, a worshipper of God. That is all. All I am is this person in front of you, Saddam Hussein, one of God's worshippers.

[Hirayama] Is it not a coincidence that your birthplace is the same as that of Saladin, Tikrit?

[Hussein] Tikrit is a historical place. It is an important Arab town and a great Iraqi town of the glorious Arab nation. As you say, it is the place where Saladin was born.

[Hirayama] Your portrait on a white horse is very impressive, and I have seen it in photographs and portraits in many places. It reminds us of the reemergence of Saladin.

[Hussein] I do not know for sure whether Saladin's horse was white; I think it was chestnut-colored.

[Hirayama] The French magazine *L'EXPRESS* revealed some American plans, the so-called "Desert Camel", in which they predict that they can break your armed forces within four days. Did you read the article, and what are your comments?

[Hussein] I believe it will require very sustained perseverance for the United States to carry out operations. I think the code-name that has been given to this plan, "Night Camel", would be more fitting for an Arab plan because the Arabs are patient and they can take things patiently. The camel belongs to the Arabs. I wonder if they used the word camel for the code-name of a plan to make fun of the Arab people. Americans always make fun of Arabs on camels.

We are eager for peace and we work for peace to be established in this region and the world at large. Iraq has no desire for war. It is said that I want war, but that is what American leaders think. It is incorrect. The Americans' way of thinking is dangerous. It will become clear in the future that the Americans are the ones longing for war.

As you know, civilization emerged in the era before Christ. In its 6,000-year history, Iraq has been faced with the danger of aggression by various nations. Throughout its 6,000-year history, we have never read or heard that Iraq surrendered in just four days. Of course, the people of Iraq are very well aware of this fact. Iraq is not so weak as to allow the American leaders to achieve their goal. The people of Iraq are a people who love peace because it is only natural that a cultured people, or people with such a civilization behind them, should strongly love to maintain peace. But, if they are compelled to fight a war, the Iraqi people will fight courageously.

Speech to FOR Peace Delegation October 21, 1990, by Saadi Mahdi Salih, Speaker of the Iraqi National Assembly

We are pleased to receive you as I know you work for peace and against war.

There is a misunderstanding of the Iraqi position around the recent events in Kuwait. Of course I will not go deep into the details. You can get acquainted with this information through the letter of our foreign minister to other foreign ministers of the world.

But I would rather talk about the problems arising from the unification of Kuwait to Iraq. As a speaker of the Iraqi Parliament I would like to express the opinion of Iraqis toward you the United States of America concerning this problem. Maybe some parts of my speech will not be so diplomatic. I tell you that the problem of Kuwait is an Arab and local internal problem. Arabs themselves could deal with and solve this problem. There is no pretext nor any justification for the intervention of others in this problem. Any other party or a third party that brings interference into this problem will raise or will increase the complication of this problem.

As it has happened, concerning your country's stand toward this problem, two days after the entering of our troops into Kuwait, our President Saddam Hussein, King Fahd, King Hussein, President Ali Abdulla Salih, and President Hosni Mubarek had agreed upon holding an Arab summit to deal with this problem. Iraq had given a pledge or promise to withdraw its troops as soon as it had been decided upon this problem. But instead of holding that summit your country's Defense Ministry, Mr. Cheney, had come to King Fahd, and instead of holding the summit, the American troops came to the region. When the American troops came to the region, the situation has been complicated to a very high standard. This situation has occurred because of a simple reason, that is because Arabs, in general, and Iraqis, in particular, are not subject to force.

Your country, or your government in particular, has claimed that it came to the region in order to defend or protect the regime of King Fahd. At the time, this regime of King Fahd is not threatened by any party for a very simple reason that Iraq is linked with Saudi Arabia in a non-aggression agreement and Iraq has adhered to this agreement. So this pretext is not a correct one, it is a false one, because we are always affirming that we have no aggressive intentions nor any intentions toward the regime.

The other reason under which your government declared it would stay in the region is to protect the oil field in the region. I may ask: Who has threatened the oil fields? There is not anyone who has threatened the oil fields.

There is a fact that may be hidden from you by your government. Until the fifth or sixth of last August, Iraq was selling one third of its oil to the United States of America, that is one third of Iraqi oil (which is 1,100,000 barrels a day) at market level prices. Iraq hadn't prevented selling its oil to any country in the world and it didn't call for high prices. And since the high rate of oil prices in 1974, Iraq had called for reasonable prices for oil in order to avoid any high raising of the oil prices. There are many speeches by our President, His Excellency Saddam Hussein, at that time. We keep them as documents of evidence. We are still believing that oil should be exported to any part of the world at a reasonable price. And we are in need to be selling our oil because we are in need to develop our country. As our President Saddam Hussein said we are in need to sell our oil and not to drink it or to freeze it.

There is a fact that might be hidden from you, which is that in 1974 to 1980 because of the difficulties arising from the high oil prices and increasing of oil prices, Iraq donated 9 million dollars to those countries that suffered from the high price of oil.

So we are not those who are preventing the flow of oil to the markets of the world. Currently this oil has been stopped because of the embargo of the United States of America against Iraq. So we don't hold ourselves responsible for the stopping or prevention of oil flow to the markets of the world. And two days before today Iraq had announced its readiness to sell its oil to all countries of the world at 21 dollars a barrel—even to the United States—and the revenues will be deposited in many banks in the world until the ending of the current crisis.

You allow me not to speak in a diplomatic way regarding your government's third pretext or claim that it came to the region to protect international law. May I ask: Who had violated the international law first? Iraq or your government? Didn't your government use its power to impose its policies in Vietnam? Didn't it try to attack Cuba? Didn't it intervene in Chile? Also didn't it intervene in Grenada and in Panama? So your government has used its force and power to impose its policies on several countries of the world. Are these not examples of violations of international law?

Your government claims that it came to the region in order to apply or implement the resolutions of the Security Council concerning Iraq. Yet those UN resolutions were prepared by the United States of America in a very short time without giving a chance for the member states in the Security Council to discuss those resolutions before their adoption. So we consider those resolutions not valid for these reasons. But as examples we use them and we mention them.

So in the way then the United States of America came to commence such a number of resolutions by the Security Council in this short time, why didn't it take the same actions toward 166 resolutions adopted concerning the Palestinian issue? As well we may ask why didn't it use force or adopt the same action regarding the 400 resolutions taken by the General Assembly toward the similar problem of Palestine? So unfortunately, it is something painful that the United States of America was opposing the UN General Assembly and the Security Council toward adoption of such resolutions. We may also feel painful concerning the using by the United States of America of the veto 80 times against the adoption of firm resolutions against Israel.

Several months ago your government used the veto against the United Nations sending a fact-finding mission to the occupied territories to become acquainted with the conditions of those Palestinian children and women who suffered the aggression and attacks being carried out by Israel. There was also one such resolution by the Security Council to send a similar fact-finding mission to Israel, yet the United States of America hadn't taken action toward putting any pressure on Israel to receive such a mission. So we deem it illogical for a country that uses a double criteria in dealing with international cases to claim the defense of international legitimacy in this case.

Your government also claims to defend democracy and human rights. But we may ask: Which regime is your government defending? Is it logical to say that the Fahd regime or the Al-Sabah regime is a democratic? I may tell you that these regimes are not democratic. They don't even believe in human rights. They even don't care for the life of human beings like you.

Even according to the Islamic belief or principles we can't call those regimes Islam regimes. Because according to the Islamic teaching and principles a Muslim should not have the right to be so rich that one may waste all one's money on corruption and entertainment while all the time his brother Muslim is suffering from starvation and death. Yet all the time these al-Fahd and Al-Sabah families are wasting millions of dollars every year on their corruption, gambling, and entertainment, at the same time in the same area one million and a half Sudanese and other Arab people are dying from starvation. So according to the Islamic belief, we cannot consider them Islamic regimes.

Therefore, it is better for your government to protect and defend regimes like Tunisia or Jordan, and not defend very backward regimes like al-Fahd and al-Sabah. (I do not mention Iraq, not because Iraq is not a democracy, but even if Iraq had a democracy of the type similar to your country, your government would not be convinced of our democracy.)

Frankly speaking, your government would like to control over the resources of oil in this region in order to control over the world economy. We consider this an unjust point of view.

So, what does it mean when a state announces that it will not allow Iraq to control over 20% of the oil in this region? Who has given it such authority to control over the interests of the world? As Arabs we say you, as the United States of America, have not the right to have all these huge quantities of wealth and control over these quantities of wealth.

We think that your government is aspiring to or would like to control the food of the world and the energy of the world in order to be politically controlling the world. So we think that this is the objective of your government and these are its political plans for coming to the region and not to protect al-Sabah or al-Fahd. We came to this conclusion through our experience with your government. Even before the recent events in Kuwait, your government wanted to impose a particular plan or policy on this region. When we rejected that policy, it stopped the shipments of food stuffs: the wheat and rice. (This was back in March of this year.)

So, if the United States of America is aspiring to establish good relations with Arabs, it has to take into consideration the interests of Arabs at the same time that it takes into consideration the interests of itself. And it must deal with the problems of the world with the same criteria. Because the rights of the Arab people are not so different from the rights of American, British, or Japanese.

So, just as you would like to live free in your country and enjoy your wealth of your country, we Arabs also desire to live freely and enjoy our wealth. So, just as you also have chosen the kind of regime that is very convenient to you, Arabs also have the right to choose the political regime that is convenient to them. So these

facts should be well understood by the American People in order to put more pressure on the US government to deal with countries by the same standard. Otherwise, the slogans of your government on human rights or defense of democracy will be false and without any meaning.

So, what does it mean to blockade or boycott a people, like the people of Iraq, to stop the food stuffs and medicines under the pretense of protecting those backward and reactionary regimes? Yet your government had imposed an economic embargo on Iraq even before the resolutions of the Security Council. It has now imposed this embargo on the air and land and sea. If it was within the ability of the United States to stop the air from reaching Iraq it would do that too. So is this not to be considered a violation of human rights? Do not the 18 million Iraqis have the same rights as those in the United States claim to defend? So, if we may suppose, even, that, if the Iraq government had committed a mistake, what is the crime committed by the people, including the old men, the children and the women who have been prevented from the milk and medicine they have been in need of? Are these the concepts of human rights in your country? We didn't announce that we want war. We didn't claim anything of the United States of America. We didn't attack the United States, not by speech and not by action. But your government has rather attacked our country.

I may ask how your country was unified. Was it by the traditional political actions? I have personally read about the history of your country and I have found that war took place and force was utilized by the northern states to unify with the southern ones. And now the formation of the United States of America is the most super power in the world. Did you consider this action by those leaders of your country was mistaken? I think you are proud of them, because they have founded and established your strong country. So why do you permit yourself to use force to unify your country, when you don't permit Arabs to use force in unifying their countries--taking into consideration that the outcome that was won from that was one nation and one territory? Now Europe is going to unify even though there are many nationalities and many peoples. Yet this is accepted by you, while unity for the Arabs is not accepted by you, even though the Arabs desire this unity also.

I may submit all this to you as facts, but I don't mean that I believe Arabs should use force in the unification their countries. I may also mention a fact that the ambitions and feelings of the Arabs are toward unity. It is correct that some rulers are not accepting this unity because their interests are linked with outside powers. But I am talking about the Arab people. If you ask the Algerians, or the Lebanese, or the Iraqis or the Yemenis, they will answer you that they are aspiring for unity. These are Arab countries and the world should respect them and not try to stop or condemn them.

We may assure the world that the unification of Arabs is not considered as threatening to the world, but the opposite. The Arabs are not selfish people. We are not attempting to gain hegemony over the interests of the world as others are attempting now. Also Arabs are not aggressive people. We are always endeavoring to live in peace with other peoples.

Now we are suffering this siege, but we are not taking aggressive acts. So it was a very great mistake committed by your country when it sent troops to this region, the territory of which is considered sacred and the most holy of places, and non-Muslims are not permitted to be there. Thus this action will create hatred-ness toward your country.

We may go back to another point: that is the subject of "guests." Frankly speaking I may tell you that it was among the most difficult decision to be taken by us: our decision concerning those nationals as "guests" in our country. That is for a simple reason: we do believe in human rights and we don't believe a human being should be used as an instrument for bargaining for a political stand or for money. But when you become acquainted with the facts you will grant us our reasons. After the events of Kuwait we realized our 18 million Iraqi people had become threatened with a rapid death through a possible aggression by the American troops on our country. In addition our people are threatened by slow death from the economic embargo imposed by the United States of America against our country. Yet for the time being the whole world is worried about the conditions, the rights, and the lives of several hundred people who are considered as "guests" living in our country. What has happened to those people is that they have lost a part of their freedom, but not all their freedom.

But what about the 18 million Iraqi people who have lost their total freedom due to the economic embargo imposed by your government? And they are even threatened by rapid death through a possible attack or war launched by your government or this slow death from starvation resulting from the prevention of imported foodstuffs. Do those 18 million Iraqi people deserve the sympathy of the world?

We don't call those people whom we host to prevent war or an attack "hostages." Because we didn't put them in prison. Neither in an arrest place or camp. But rather we let them live with Iraqi families. In houses that are perhaps considered better than those the average Iraqis live in themselves. We provide them with all facilities and the requirements of daily life, including foodstuff, medical care, and other entertainment facilities. Even so, we are feeling painful with them [we empathize with them] because they have lost part of their freedom--that is, the right of leaving for their home country--and we do appreciate the volume of the impact of this condition on their personal state. And we do hope that they will enjoy their total freedom as soon as possible.

Another reason we don't consider them as "hostages" is because we are not calling for money or a political stand in replacement of them. Rather all that we have asked for is that the United States of America give a pledge or promise not to launch any attack or aggression against Iraq. And we do think that this is a reasonable, logical, and applicable requirement that is possible to be applied. Therefore, we call them "guests" and "messengers of peace." It is correct that they are feeling some pain because they have lost part of their freedom. But I rather think that they will be more pleased and proud at the end of this crisis due to what they have given to Iraqis in particular and to humankind in general. . . . [end of tape this side] . . .

What will the price of oil be, if the oil of the whole region is stopped from reaching the markets of the world? Because the shellings and missiles will affect not only the soldiers, but will explode all the area. Then the world will lose about 60% of the reserve of oil. At that time the oil price will be about \$100 a barrel. Economists among you may well understand what does it mean if a barrel of oil costs \$100. It will lead to a dangerous economic recession. So if this happens then a catastrophe will face the world.

We don't want war, not because we are afraid for ourselves, rather because we are afraid for the future of humanity. Therefore we are quite ready to cooperate with all international organizations and personalities and other endeavors which are endeavoring to avoid the eruption of war in this area. So we are so pleased and we welcome you as a group of peace loving people against war.

I may apologize for talking so long and bringing you this burden, but you may give me the right because I have a case and I have to clarify these facts. And I am interested in the fate and future of 18 million Iraqis as you are interested in the fate and future of these hundreds of people. Those 18 million Iraqi people like to live in happiness, security, and peace as the other peoples of the world like those in France, Britain, and others countries are living. They don't want war. And when you meet those Iraqi people you will find them generous people and very kind.

[In response to a question concerning the need for dialog.] This is the responsibility of your government which rejected any dialog, particularly the initiative of the 12th of August which included comprehensively all the problems of the region. It had also rejected the initiative of the 19th of August which dealt with resolving the issue of guests. So this initiative of the 19th of August presented by President Saddam Hussein briefly includes [as a condition] a pledge by the USA not to attack or launch war against Iraq, at that time all nationalities will be free to back home. We don't reject dialog with any party. But Bush himself has rejected dialog.

[In response to a question about contacting the foreign nationals being held in Iraq.] As for letters and messages you have for those people, the Iraqi Red Crescent Society is ready to receive those letters and deliver them. Then there are also Post Office Boxes dedicated for exchanging messages with those guests. So as I mentioned to you, be reassured about those people because we have provided them with even more care than our people. We, as Arabs, we are always generous to our guests. So even in case of war or attack by the USA against Iraq, we have given them protection. Our President Saddam Hussein has promised them that they will have their places in shelters even before Iraqis if war happens. But we can not be sure of the protection capability of our shelters because the shells and bombs of the USA are so sophisticated, so these shelters may be destroyed and for that we apologize.

Concerning the logic of war and peace, I am not talking about the theoretical side, but through experience, wars are always causing damages and disasters. We have been in war for 8 years. The most dangerous and sophisticated weapons were used during that war. And we had suffered a lot during that war, as did the American soldiers and fighters who suffered during the Vietnam war. So, in order to avoid human suffering once again we have to pray for peace and avoid the eruption of such a war.

The last comment I have: It is said that the United States is a rich country and the people a rich people. I would like to tell you that Iraq is also a rich country, but because of the conspiring against it, it is not in this kind of situation. I would also like to explain that we have no hatred-ness for those rich people. We are aspiring that all of humanity will be happy.

If we will talk about richness and poorness, I have given you an example from the teachings of Islam. I just want to qualify a point: Of course these principles are from teachings meant to establish social justice among Muslims. But, of course, I am not saying that Islamic principles do not allow people to be rich. It accepts that some people may become rich. But the principles say that when you are a rich man you must not forget or neglect those who are poor. You should not let them starve to death. You shouldn't leave them suffering from diseases when you are able to assist. And when you have a problem, you have to cooperate with them in order to solve it.

To be more clear about these points, you may review the teachings of Christianity. The same points are clear there. So all the holy religions extend from the same principles and teachings. And for your information, Islam and Christianity are on the same level, and are promoting a great service for humanity in general. I will not talk too much about this subject. You may become better acquainted with it when you meet the Iraqi people.

Once again, we are very pleased by your existence among us and we are quite ready to provide you with all facilities you may require.

Excerpts from an Interview with National Assembly Speaker Saadi Mahdi Salih by Hamidah Na'na' in October 1990

[Na'na'] Was there no alternative to the decision to enter Kuwait?

[Salih] Although we regard Kuwait as part of Iraqi territory and of our national sovereignty, there was no prior decision to enter Kuwait. We were the ones who drew up the pan-Arab charter and advocated a policy of Arab solidarity and joint defense, and we were the ones who said that Arab arms should not be used against Arabs. If you go back to the pan-Arab charter you will see that it contained a number of interlinked articles which cannot be separated.

One such article was that no Arab should seek the help of foreigners against his brother Arabs. If you go back a little to the events which preceded our entry into Kuwait you will see that, in addition to the United Arab Emirates, the former Kuwaiti Government insisted on implementing a secret plot against Iraq. The plot against us culminated in the telephone conversation which took place between King Fahd and the amir of Qatar. In that conversation there was a reference to a specific time for the implementation of a major design against Iraq. If you listened to that conversation you would see that they set a period of two months during which the fates of Saddam Hussein, Iraq, and the Palestinian question would be settled, as happened to President 'Abd-al-Nasir.

We had all that information and we learned that several measures were being implemented against us in stages, beginning with economic pressure to be followed by a U.S. landing in Kuwait to take control of it, after which they would control oil prices any way they liked and prevent Iraq benefiting from its resources.

Iraq has come out of an eight-year war in dire need of its national wealth for rebuilding and development and to meet the requirements of defense and industrialization. The oil policies of Kuwait and the UAE harmed our programs and delayed the fulfillment of our commitments. We had to act because, if we did not, the enemy would advance and deal its blow.

The chance came with the Kuwaiti officers' movement. There was an appeal and we responded immediately.

[Na'na'] You responded to King Fahd's call for a five-power summit conference to tackle the issue within an Arab context. Why, in your view, did that summit fail?

[Salih] We agreed to the conference and expressed our readiness to withdraw immediately if the issue was tackled within an Arab framework, and we did in fact withdraw some of our forces, but when foreign fleets and forces rushed to the region, the Kuwaiti officers asked us to stay, and then they asked for unity. We were placed in a position where we had to face the conspirators. I am confident that we will win the battle and that that will mark the beginning of a new era.

Interview with Taha Yasin Ramadan, First Deputy Prime Minister and Revolution Command Council member, by Hamidah Na'na' in October 1990

[Na'na'] You have accustomed us to being frank and explicit in your statements and positions. The Arab nation is now in the most dangerous stage in its history. The Gulf crisis is the best example of these dangers. In spite of the support for Iraq by the man in the street in the Arab East and Arab Maghreb, there are some questions we hope can be answered in this interview.

[Ramadan] I do not say that we had no other course than the one we took. But I would like to tell you that we thought of such a course only one month before it took place. We had not discussed it, or proposed it as a solution. We had put our faith in dialogue and had pinned our hopes on it. However, we reached a dead-end, and the dialogue failed. In spite of this, we tried to give the matter more time. But we discovered that the former Kuwaiti rulers were deeply involved in a big conspiracy, particularly in connection with the economic aspects of this conspiracy. When we discovered this, after the failure of dialogue, we made our decision without hesitation.

[Na'na'] Iraqi forces entered Kuwait following the OPEC conference at which Kuwait announced its willingness to abide by the quotas allotted to it, and by the prices that were agreed. It is true that, although the Kuwaiti oil minister had stated that Kuwaiti would abide by this until the end of the year, there still remained five months between July and the end of the year during which dialogue over the other issues could have been developed. Was the move into Kuwait motivated by other problems concerning the oilfields in the south, and the issue of borders, or did the Jeddah meeting reveal other dimensions of the disagreement that could not be solved, such as the threat of a U.S. landing in Kuwait on 7 August, as the U.S. and Western media reported after the incident?

[Ramadan] First, we do not view the question of the oil price tampering by Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates --although it has a serious impact on our economic security--as being the only form of conspiracy. It is true that, in the end they retracted their stand and announced their abidance by the OPEC resolutions, but we knew that this abidance did not stem from a real conviction. They had no intention of implementing it. The Kuwaiti oil

minister's statement was clear. Therefore, the purpose of announcing their abidance was to mitigate Iraqi anger for some time while in secret the conspiracy against us continued.

I will explain this by telling you the following two stories. At the Jeddah meeting a few days before the convening of the OPEC Geneva conference, a quadripartite agreement was reached among Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and the UAE, according to which each of these countries agreed to abide by the oil production quota allocated to it. However, the problem does not lie here. The problem is that two Gulf states--namely, Kuwait and the UAE--announced in the wake of the Jeddah conference that their abidance by their quotas would be temporary. As for the Kuwaiti Oil Minister, he announced that his country would comply with its quota for two months. After these two months, his country would ask for an increase of its quota and also for an increase in oil prices, the minister added.

Regarding what happened, you are the one to whom the statement was made in Geneva. If we were to link this to the telephone conversation on 9 July 1990 between King Fahd and the Qatari amir in which the king urged, or seemed to urge the oil ministers of those Arabian Gulf states to respond favorably and deal quietly with the Iraqi minister at the OPEC conference to overcome this phase. In that conversation, King Fahd added that the ministers can decide whatever they want when they meet in the absence of their Iraqi counterpart. All this confirms that these countries' abidance by OPEC prices and production quotas was designed to assuage anger, not to abandon the conspiracy. As for the conspiracy, it was nurtured and going full swing against Iraq. However, Arab parties asked us to give a chance for another round of Arab talks. That is why we decided to meet with the Kuwaitis in Jeddah. However, the meeting failed due to the absence of any signs of change in the Kuwaiti rulers' position.

[Na'na'] What specifically happened at the Jeddah conference?

[Ramadan] The dialogue in Jeddah did not produce the expected results. Therefore, Iraq circulated a memorandum at the Arab League saying it would accept nothing that would harm its interests. When we found out that the Kuwaiti rulers intended to reject anything that would settle the outstanding issues Iraq had brought up; that they reject everything and every Iraqi right regarding borders, losses, and the oil policy, we became certain that they had decided to persist in the conspiracy. The statements made here and there announcing commitment on some issues were a reflection of a tactical position. We then realized that this phase was not going to last, even though it might continue for two or several months.

Our policy is well-known. When we have a dispute or differences of opinion with an Arab side, we show patience while attempting to resolve the dispute or differences of opinion. But when we become certain that there is a conspiracy, our patience begins to have limits. We do not entertain compromise solutions in this regard. The conspiracy must be halted.

The U.S. and British plans drawn up with the Gulf rulers to allow the U.S. and Britain to establish bases and maintain a presence in the Gulf were conspicuous. The pretext advanced was that Iraq posed a threat to the Arabian Gulf states. They convinced the Gulf rulers of this. Otherwise, how would you explain the presence of the tankers that came to the Gulf to protect Kuwaiti oil during the last years of the war? And when the war was halted, why did the Kuwaitis insist that these tankers should remain in the Gulf, despite the fact that the tankers and the U.S. Navy ships escorting them cost Kuwait heavily? Why did Kuwait continue to defend this presence?

[Na'na'] Arab public opinion was surprised by the step you took the day you entered Kuwait, despite the fact that your differences with Kuwait and the UAE dated back more than six months prior to the move. Why did you not advise public opinion of these differences? Why did you not talk about this dispute? Do you not think that public opinion could influence the solution of this crisis? If not, do you not think that public opinion at least should have been told about what was going on, or prepared to receive what is going to happen?

[Ramadan] A point should be noted here; namely, that Iraq's leadership has great patience. We are the only Iraqi leadership in 22 years to attempt to deal with the severed part of Iraq [Kuwait] rationally, despite the fact that this case offended our thinking and principles. We exerted immense efforts to bring about understanding. The obstacle was always the Kuwaiti rulers; they rejected any formula of good-neighborliness based on understanding and exchange of interests, which essentially guarantees them what they want and gives Iraq an outlet to the sea. The former rulers rejected this, however. We tried not to bring up this issue publicly so as not to show that there were differences, in the hope that we might reach positive results through dialogue.

From the outbreak of the Iraq-Iran war, people knew there were problems. They also knew that Kuwaiti rulers used to extract oil from the al-Rumaylah field despite an agreement reached in 1980 that oil should not be drilled in this area, and that farms should not be established in disputed areas except in a joint form. If, however, there was no possibility to set up a joint venture, then the status-quo should be maintained. But this agreement was not honored during the war. We have many documents to prove that we asked them more than once to stop oil prospecting in the disputed areas. It was not in our interest to spark off a battle with Kuwait while we were already engaged in a war. They, however, were not ashamed to exploit the war situation and reveal their ill intentions. We tried not to let the dispute surface so as not to engender lasting strong feelings; because if that happened, the possibility of understanding would become much more difficult. Recently, the price of one barrel of oil reached \$11. Thus, we became almost convinced that there was no hope in dialogue. Consequently, Arab

citizens and officials should know what was happening between us. Therefore, there was the 14 July memorandum to the Arab League, and after that to all Arab presidents. Some leaders were not surprised, because they knew about the dispute, or because we told them most of the details of the dispute. Some told us that they supported our viewpoint.

Subsequent events proved to us that the rulers of Kuwait were involved in the conspiracy. Thus, the results of any delay on our part to take measures would not have been guaranteed. For example, if forces arrived in the region before 2 August and the conspiracy was implemented, what would the result have been then? Could what happened on 2 August have happened on 2 September? Arab public opinion would have known the details, only too late. Were there better circumstances and capabilities on 2 September to foil the conspiracy? We cannot be sure.

[Na'na'] The end result is that the Arabs are now divided over your presence in Kuwait.

[Ramadan] Only the official Arab stand.

[Na'na'] On the international level, it is as you see it. Most countries of the world are against your presence there, as no other council resolutions have been passed as quickly as the present ones, not to mention the siege imposed on Iraq. However, initiatives are being proposed in the West, specifically the French initiative, whose provisions you know very well. Suppose the conditions for the success of this initiative are right, will Iraq agree to withdraw from Kuwait in accordance with the initiative's proposals for a referendum and the right to self-determination?

[Ramadan] Any initiative that contains preconditions is no longer an initiative. Any formula for a political solution that sets one or two conditions for a dialogue can no longer be viewed as an initiative. We are interested in and appreciate the French initiative and President Mitterrand's speech at the United Nations. This is so because it is the first speech within the framework of a political solution that comes from a major European country, and because we are convinced that it has been made with good and sound intentions for settling the issue in a peaceful manner, especially since the initiative mentioned the linkage among the issues in the region although without specifying this linkage. We hope that France will not forget, and will keep in mind the Iraqi initiative of 12 August.

The French initiative has raised hopes and has introduced a common language. We hope that through the initiative we submitted and through the French initiative we may reach a solution. From a principled point of view, when we say that Kuwait is part of Iraq, this is not just rhetoric but documented and known. We are also serious when we say that we are ready to settle this problem on the Arab level with one formula and on the international level with another formula. We said that, on the international level, we should work to solve all the issues of the region in chronological order and on specific terms. We are fully committed to this. Sanctions will be imposed on any of the concerned parties that do not abide by this. But to discuss the issue of Kuwait and the Gulf, and to issue resolutions on it, while only giving a promise to show an interest in the Middle East cause is--with all due respect to any country that adopts such a position--is not reassuring, and cannot be accepted.

[Na'na'] With the sudden Iraqi move into Kuwait, Iraq's previous Arab policy began to be questioned. Iraq produced the Pan-Arab Charter. Similarly, Iraq has always championed Arab solidarity. Moreover, Iraq hosted the latest Arab summit, which was supposed to have laid foundations for inter-Arab cooperation and Arab security. In addition, Iraq is a member of the Arab Cooperation Council. Before making such a move, was Iraq not supposed to have consulted with the other ACC partners? Iraq's entry into Kuwait surprised everybody and made this whole policy highly questionable. To say the least, given the present developments, it became difficult for others to understand the past policies.

[Ramadan] As regards the Iraqi move, I believe it has enhanced all of the principles you have just mentioned. What we have done does not contravene these principles. We have to tackle matters smoothly and quietly. All of these principles bolstered the pan-Arab and unionist ideals that we cherish and uphold. The objective behind these principles is to remind everybody that Israel still exists in the heartland of this nation, and also to remind everybody that there is injustice. The rich are getting richer, whereas the poor in the Arab homeland are getting poorer. Arab solidarity should not be construed to mean an umbrella for protecting agents and spies. As for the Charter, it should not be viewed as an instrument of protection for regimes that seek the help of foreign powers.

Iraq continues to uphold and have faith in all the principles that it has long held. Its objective is to enhance and bolster the nation's potentialities so as to achieve unity and to strengthen it. Is the unification of the severed parts of the homeland an act against the nation's unity? Does the call for investing Arab funds inside the Arab homeland go against Arab solidarity? If this solidarity were to protect those who make Arab funds serve foreigners, we are against this type of solidarity. We vindicate Arab rights. To achieve this objective, we have upheld solidarity.

As for the ACC, it is a newly established council. It was established only one year ago. As a matter of fact, there was no security cooperation among the ACC member states. Egypt opposed any discussion of the issue. As regards the agreement not to interfere in the internal affairs of other states and not to use force, we proposed such a draft agreement within the ACC. However, Egypt rejected this draft agreement. Hence,

agreements in this regard were signed with only Jordan and Yemen. A draft agreement in this area was discussed by the ACC Ministerial Council when I was the chairman of the Council. Three ACC members voted in favor of the draft agreement, while Egypt demanded amendments to the draft agreement. We accepted Egypt's amendments. Later, the Council met and the draft agreement was put to the vote. The Egyptians refused to vote on it and asked that it be withdrawn from the agenda.

In my capacity as a chairman of the Ministerial Council at the time, I refused to drop the draft agreement from the agenda. I told them that the issue had to be decided at the summit, and that we have no right to cancel or erase it because the summit is the party responsible for endorsing it. The meeting adjourned then. When we typed the agenda and added this point and sent it to our governments, I received a lengthy memorandum from Egypt expressing surprise that this point was included in the agenda when they had asked not to include it. I said to them: You asked for this, but three countries have not asked for it, and our charter states that decisions are made by a majority vote, unless the system is amended or other countries join the ACC. We were three against one.

Moreover, we had recommended that this paragraph be discussed at the summit to be held in Alexandria. When I left for the summit a day prior to the departure of the president, President Husni Mubarak asked to see me and insisted that this paragraph be dropped from the agenda. It was obvious that he did not want to be embarrassed by discussing it at the summit with President Saddam Hussein. I told him there was no reason for embarrassment and that President Saddam Hussein would discuss the point with you, but it will not be mentioned in the final statement. And this is what happened.

[Na'na'] Why did Egypt reject it? What was their opinion?

[Ramadan] President Mubarak said that the issue would create problems for Egypt, with Israel, and America. He added that the ACC was an economic council. As for security, there is a collective defense pact signed at the Arab League.

[Na'na'] Does it contravene the Camp David agreement?

[Ramadan] Yes, this was the real reason. However, they did not want to say that. And, indeed, we did not discuss it and withdrew it practically.

[Na'na'] And Egypt did not even coordinate in the security area with Jordan and Yemen?

[Ramadan] No. They insisted on rejecting this issue in a strange manner, despite the fact that it would serve the Arab nation.

[Na'na'] Anyone who reads your press or watches your television cannot help noticing that your attack is concentrated primarily on two Arab regimes, the Egyptian and Saudi regimes, while you avoid attacking the Syrian regime, even though it has gone farther than the Egyptian regime. For, as soon as the Iranian-Iraqi agreement was announced, the president of Syria traveled to Tehran to convince the Iranians not to cooperate with Iraq. How could you explain this to us, especially since Syria is your special concern?

[Ramadan] My special concern is the Arab homeland. All of us at the leadership have the Arab homeland as our special concern. This is the only thing we understand. For, if anyone does not understand the issues of his household, then how can he understand the issues of others? We Arabs understand France's affairs more than our own. So, how can those rulers lead their countries. I cannot point out all the reasons. However, I can say that Iraq--by our leadership--imparted some nationalism and patriotism to Mubarak and Fahd. I know that many blame us because we gave them our attention, and helped Egypt join the ACC. Therefore, I find it necessary to remove this illusion that exists in the minds of some people.

Yes, King Fahd is the one who invited the foreigner to Arab lands. As for Mubarak, he is the director of the political drama acting to cover up for the foreign presence. But it goes without saying that he is a failing director. At the Cairo summit, the Americans were unsuccessful in their efforts to provide a happy ending to their drama. I said this there.

As for Abu-Sulayman [meaning President al-Asad], he is now "totally exposed." There is no need for us to tell people any more about his role. He is like the owner of a small grocery. He waits until chicken is in short supply. When that happens, he rushes to buy chicken to make profit. His preoccupation in major issues is now over. When the opportunity presented itself to him, he dispatched 25,000 troops, after calculating their salaries which he will collect. Finally, as you know, he submitted a memorandum to the parties concerned listing the damage that he has incurred as a result of the Gulf developments. I find this strange, as he now benefits from these developments. He is now selling his oil at higher prices. There is no oil pipeline operating across Syrian territory for him to say that it was closed and caused him to suffer. Besides, there is no transit of commodities between our two countries. How then, has he suffered any losses? He benefited from the current situation. Yes, he went to Iran to influence the Iranians. We are used to such conduct from Hafiz al-Asad. Nowadays, we do not feel any need to enlighten ordinary citizens about Hafiz al-Asad. Why then should we make the effort?

[Na'na'] This means that you view him as a man done for, who does not merit any effort to expose?

[Ramadan] Yes, he is a loser and has only a short time left in power. In this battle, the Arab masses will end the rule of his ilk. Arab issues constitute an indivisible whole. In our initiative of 12 August, we highlighted the Palestine question and the Lebanese issue.

[Na'na'] Are you really prepared militarily for the battle, despite the fact that estimates of world experts confirm that the losses would be immense if war were to erupt? In your last statement, you threatened to set the region ablaze and to strike at both Saudi Arabia and Israel. Is Iraq actually capable of doing this? Can Iraq hold out in a battle of this type with the world, the whole world, poised against it?

[Ramadan] The important thing is that we, our people, and our nation's masses are convinced that we are on the side of right and that Kuwait is part of our territory. As for how others will act, that is up to them. On 2 August 1990, we were aware that Zionism and the United States would oppose any moves to regain our rights, regardless of the nature and type of these rights, especially if these moves were coupled with serious efforts to enhance Arab capabilities to pave the way for vindicating our central Palestinian cause. We are aware of all this.

Likewise, we are aware that the battle is now two months late. Moreover, we know that if the battle were to break out and if they were to fix its zero hour, they would not be able to define its scope nor to put an end to it. We have decided not to fire the first round to make the world know that we are sparing no efforts to initiate dialogue and bring about peace. We will continue to pursue this policy until the last moment. Those who speak of a lightning war of a few hours or a few days, are mistaken. I am saying that Iraq will not be the only battle zone. The battle will also take place in the lands of their agents. From the first moment, the lands of their agents, including Israel, will be a major battle zone.

[Na'na'] Your people fought for eight years and endured courageously. Do you feel that these same people will put up with a battle that will match your ambitions as leaders?

[Ramadan] Our people, whom you know quite well, are tired of passivity. When man feels that something so dear has become accessible, he becomes ready to make sacrifices and his weariness evaporates into thin air. Our people have made sacrifices over an eight-year period. When they feel that their hopes and the hopes of the Arab nation are about to be realized, they reach the conclusion that a bold posture will make them forget about their weariness.

[Na'na'] Some Arabs accuse you of dragging the Americans into the region. Certainly you expected me to ask you this question, because it is much repeated by the news media. Supposing that war breaks out and drags on, what will guarantee the Americans' departure from the region?

[Ramadan] Are the Americans children, that we can drag them into the region? The Americans intended to control the oil wells. We have heard their statements and announcements. In the light of these statements, in which they expressed their intentions, how can it be said that we dragged them into the region? We said, if they seek to plot against us we will not allow them to do so, because we will be lying in wait for them. We say if the war erupts, the oil fields under the United States' control will no longer be there. The oil wells are not a matchbox that they can put in their pockets and send to their country. The oil wells are on Arab territory; they are not concealed under a mountain from all eyes. It will really be, as they say, a third world war. The third world war may break out on a battlefield only, but this war will not be confined to a battlefield. There will be other fields where real economic fighting will take place and the world will be deprived of 60 percent of its oil needs. This will lead to an economic collapse and to conflicts and interventions even in arenas the Arab hand will not reach militarily.

[Na'na'] You are talking about an Arab solution to the crisis. Suppose that King Fahd lands at Baghdad airport tomorrow to tell you: Let us negotiate a solution to this crisis. Would you accept King Fahd as your interlocutor?

[Ramadan] Yes, we accept. When Saudi Arabia realizes that no danger is posed to it by Iraq, we will be ready for a direct dialogue with it. We hope that the ruling Saudi family will not further implicate itself and we do not want the Saudi family to end at our hands. Iraq had no intention of entering Saudi Arabia, nor did it plan that. If they were sincere in the search for an Arab solution, we are ready to offer guarantees to them that no danger is posed to them. Consequently, they should ask the foreign forces to leave now.

The problem of Kuwait is completely different, for Kuwait is part of Iraq and they know this quite well, and Fahd knows this personally. He also knows about the Kuwaiti rulers' plotting against us. We said this at the Cairo summit and called for the presence of Arab forces with us in the region.

[Na'na'] Where? In Saudi Arabia, or Kuwait?

[Ramadan] In Saudi Arabia; Kuwait is Iraqi territory.

[Na'na'] And you do not agree to the idea of holding a referendum in Kuwait?

[Ramadan] No.

[Na'na'] Do you mean there will be no referendum on sovereignty?

[Ramadan] Certainly. Can we ask the Palestinians if they want a referendum on their being Palestinian? Why did the Europeans not hold a referendum on forming their countries? Did the United States not unite its states through fighting and not referendum or self-determination? Why do they apply this to us and not to themselves? Now this is their excuse to maintain our dismemberment.

[Na'na'] Does this mean that the Kuwaiti people's opinion is unimportant?

[Ramadan] Kuwait, as I have already said, is part of Iraq. Would it be logical to hold a referendum to see the people of al-Basrah and al-'Amarah wish to remain part of Iraq or not? If five or six persons in an Iraqi governorate are upset, would it be acceptable for us to allow foreigners to tell us they want to ask the opinion of these people on whether they want to stay with you?

[Na'na'] Do you not see that this comparison is incorrect? Kuwait was historically part of Iraq, but this part developed a special situation. It became a state with a flag and an anthem. It became a member of the United Nations and had a Constitution. Moreover, the government of the Arab Socialist Bath Party recognized the independence of Kuwait, as I said at the beginning of this interview.

[Ramadan] We did not recognize a Constitution or border. We did not agree with them on anything. We dealt with the fait accompli. Anyway, this is a point that is recorded against us.

[Na'na'] And diplomatic relations?

[Ramadan] This is a point against us and our citizens are entitled to blame us for this behavior. However, there was nothing more than that; that is, we did not go so far as to consolidate the border and initiate full recognition.

[Na'na'] During the Gulf events the West launched a campaign against Iraq on the issue of democracy. Before the events, you had begun to implement a host of measures related to the freedom of the press and constitutional amendments. Does the present situation allow for continuing them?

[Ramadan] What do you think?

[Na'na'] I think it would be difficult to continue.

[Ramadan] I believe we are now living under the canopy of a democracy with which we are satisfied. If what happened here had happened in any other country, the Constitution would have been suspended. We are now applying democracy in an exceptional manner. Thus far, the Revolution Command Council has not decided to suspend the Constitution, or even parts of it.

[Na'na'] The campaign has concentrated on the person of the president, considering him the only decision-maker in Iraq. From my acquaintance with you, I know this is untrue. However, I would like to ask you in your capacity as a politician in the leadership who has accompanied every stage of the revolution from the beginning, how do you make your decisions within the political leadership?

[Ramadan] We should not forget the intentions of our enemies. We tell the Western news media that we cannot forget the role of Zionism and Americans in the media. Their intentions are known. We cannot say the Western media are democratic or unconnected with interventions, influences, and Zionism. Therefore, they know well the president's role over the past 22 years in building the psychology of the Iraqi individual. Instead of taking on 18 million Iraqis--and they will certainly never do so--they concentrate on one person. It is the person who has great credit in the new edifice. We Arabs differ from the West in the way we view the role of the individual in history.

If we look at Arab history since the emergence of Islam, we will find that, in every stage of history there was a symbol that was trusted by the masses of that time. His existence prompted a military, cultural, agricultural, and political awakening. Loss of the symbol at any stage led to deterioration, dismemberment, and division. An Arab is tribal, the son of a family, and a peasant who takes pride in his land and makes sure that nobody else shares it with him. He needs a leader around whom to rally. But if he believes in principles only, without the symbol in which these principles are represented, we find that his readiness to sacrifice for these principles is very limited. Therefore, change in the Iraqis' potential and ability to sacrifice is not new.

For example, if the battle with Iran had occurred before Saddam Hussein's time, Iraq would have been defeated. On the other hand, the decisions taken then resulted in all this enthusiasm and readiness to sacrifice, because they were in the interest of the people and express their conscience. Very often, decisions are issued by the largest democratic institutions but without sparking off this enthusiasm among the masses. What are their value? Had there been an ordinary liberal institution, would it have been able to take a decision like the 2 August 1990 decision? That would be impossible. However, there is no doubt that 18 million Iraqis support this decision unanimously.

We are ready to receive any party wishing to come to Iraq to see if there is a popular unanimity or not. As long as there is unanimity and a majority, the decision is correct and the accusation that the decisions are made only by Saddam Hussein is incorrect. But they realize quite well that these decisions stem from the Iraqis. Iraq is a revolutionary institution that has a long history of making basic historical decisions. This is proved by Iraq's entering all battles with a unified leadership, contrary to many countries that have entered similar battles with divisions and differences in the positions of not only the leaders but also the people. Iraq's success in its battles indicates that the decisions are studied and absorbed and are carried out only when all are convinced of them.

[Na'na'] Iraq's signing of a peace treaty with Iran surprised observers. The masses had no knowledge of the progress of negotiations. The return to the 1975 agreement has certainly brought to mind the question: What was the purpose of the war then? Moreover, the speed with which the agreement was signed following your entry into Kuwait gave the impression that there was an agreement between you and the Iranians on this entry, or that

the Iranians were aware of it. Has Iraq entered Kuwait to resolve its problem with Iran after obtaining a sea outlet, which makes the problem of Shatt al-'Arab a marginal issue? What point have your relations with Iran reached?

[Ramadan] The eight-year war was not over the 1975 agreement, which the Iranians implicitly canceled and denounced. Our signing of this agreement came in circumstances under which we had to make calculations as to whether we would lose either Iraq or half of Shatt al-'Arab. We chose what was in the best interest of Iraq when we restored the usurped part, that is Kuwait. Iraq then faced a serious plot aimed at subjugating and seizing all of Iraq from Zakho to the sea. The option was again presented to us to sign an agreement that protects our territory and safeguards our back. Once again we chose what was in the best interest of Iraq. We told Saud al-Faysal a few days before the offensive that, if they pursued their plotting under circumstances where no peaceful solution with Iran had yet been reached, and where our forces were deployed on the border, we might give up half of Shatt al-'Arab, and thus, many heads would fall. We also explained to him the 1975 agreement when Barzani and the Shah tried to threaten Iraq.

I wonder why they say today that they were surprised? On 30 May 1990 during the summit, we told them that those who starve our people in effect declare war on us. The memo we addressed to them was clear, and when Saud al-Faysal came we explained this to him. Today, the equation has changed and forces have come to the region. Therefore, we had to take a step toward Iran, because this meant that 45 Iraqi military divisions could suddenly turn around and face the U.S. forces.

As for the articles of the dialogue and the agreement, those were published in the newspapers.

[Na'na'] Has your relationship with Iran stabilized? Should we expect an alliance between you against the Western presence?

[Ramadan] We think that the Iraqi leadership has played its historical and humane role with regard to the interests of the people. Peace initiatives began in April with the first letter by President Hashemi-Rafsanjani and later came the recent great initiative on 14 August 1990. We consider this issue as closed. What remains is, what does Iran want? Does it wish to develop relations by resolving simple issues, or by resolving difficult issues? The road is open today.

If Iran was sincere in terms of its principled position on Zionism, imperialism, and the rulers of Najd and Hejaz [Saudi Arabia] and it's saying that they are incapable of protecting the holy sites, then what Iraq is doing is just that; namely facing these regimes and facing imperialism and Zionism. Hence, this is the chance for Iran to put its words into practice while Arab and Muslim masses are raising their voice to face this aggression.

I think that the Iranian leadership is sincerely and seriously considering this.

[Na'na'] We were surprised when President Saddam Hussein addressed the Muslim nation calling for the protection of the holy sites. It is known that the lands of Mecca and a-Madinah, since the honorable prophet's mission and up until now, were under the protection of the Arab Muslims, even during the Ottoman occupation when Sultan Salim made a point of keeping the keys with the honorable Arabs of Mecca.

[Ramadan] Islam does not distinguish between Arabs and non-Arabs. Nor does it distinguish between any language or race. However, all Muslims know that the Arabs had a pioneering and a leading role in all tasks and duties related to the holy sites, because they are the ones who conveyed the religious message and because the Quranic revelations were in their language. The religious message began in their land and each Muslim, regardless of his race, knows this and is proud of it. Then, it is natural to call on the Muslims to protect the land of the holy sites. The priority is for the Arabs, because the holy sites are on Arab Muslim land.

However, it is the duty of the Pakistani, Bangladesh, and Malaysian citizens to fight in defense of the holy lands if the Arab forces are not enough to defend them. Protection does not have to be a direct protection in the field. When we are able to harm the enemy's interests in any part of the world, we will be making a contribution in the battle to defend the holy sites. And, when the first bullet is fired to face imperialism, Zionism, and their allies, and when the masses rise to face the United States all over the globe to put an end to its tyranny, it also means a defense of the Muslims' sacred places and dignity.

[Na'na'] Do you believe in the role of the masses?

[Ramadan] Definitely, yes. If we go back a little to the fifties and see the battle of 1956, when the Arab masses rose against the tripartite aggression, we will understand what the action of the masses means. The nationalist Arab trend was then standing up to the aggressor. Now, the nationalist Arab and the Islamic trends have become intertwined and this gives us an idea of the positive aspects of the step taken by Iraq and the appeal that its president has made to the Arab nation.

[Na'na'] Today, the nationalist Arab political language and the religious language overlap in whatever is uttered by President Saddam Hussein, and Baghdad receives Islamic forces daily. Does this mean the end of the contradiction between nationalist Arab and religious plans?

[Ramadan] The Arab masses, with all their trends, have come out against the U.S.-imperialist enemy. This has helped strengthen our belief in the inevitability of victory and made us more convinced that the step we took was not wrong. The conflict among the forces and their preoccupation with things other than the main battle

is not in the interest of the nation. Now, it has become apparent to us that this conflict, which has lasted many years, can only be resolved by a major battle. Today, they want to prolong the battle, but this will not be in their interest, because this will strengthen cohesion among the political forces of the Arab masses; that is, cohesion between the so-called right and left. Therefore, we will move from a united Iraqi people, who managed to confront the enemy, to an Arab people of the same class who can stand united for the sake of their right and values.

The Arab people want a central command and a central battle, and they want a cause. They have a central, but dead, cause and all that which has been proposed to resolve this cause has not touched their consciousness. The Islamist remained an Islamist, the pan-Arabist remained a pan-Arabist, the leftist remained a leftist, and the rightist remained a rightist. However, the recent confrontation has proved that all the contradictions among these forces are secondary ones. To prove this, when what happened in the Gulf happened, the people inside the occupied territories--the intifadah heroes--rose in support of and solidarity with the Iraqi step even before the Arab masses outside the occupied territories did. For us, this was clear evidence that the right choice was made and that our battle is a historic one that will yield positive results for the nation. And, that is why we were not worried by all this foreign presence.

[Na'na'] Are you not worried that the Arab street will be brought under control and that its fervor will decrease?

[Ramadan] No. That depends on us. If we believe that the Arab street is serious in our battles, it will stand by our side and support us; its zeal will not be temporary. If we believe otherwise, it will abandon us. The present stand of the Arab masses made it irrefutably clear to us that holding the Arab citizen and masses responsible for all past defeats was a grave error. The Arab citizen has not played his role yet. I am certain that if it is made clear to the Arab citizen that we intend to fight the battle until the very end, and that we will not retreat from our goals, which are entrenched in his conscience and mind, then the popular stand will develop.

[Na'na'] Mr. Taha, it seems we live in a time of contradictions. At a time when the Soviet Union took a stand against Iraq during its latest steps, your historical friend came closer to Saudi Arabia and established diplomatic ties. The same applies to the PRC. What is your view about the establishment of diplomatic relations between Saudi Arabia and the Soviet Union?

[Ramadan] Because of many considerations, I do not wish to delve into this topic. I will only say that I hope the Soviet Union does not retreat any further than it has already and leave the arena to the United States. I also hope that the Soviet administration will not buy the common wisdom that U.S. forces are invincible, because that would turn the Soviet Union into a dependent; this is precisely what we do not wish to see happen. What we would like is for every country in the world to be free, never mind the Soviet Union. We have said and continue to say that the Third World countries still have a chance before them, especially since the region we are in is a very sensitive and influential region. I know that the Soviet Union has difficult internal problems, but these problems should not occupy it away from its role in serving world peace.

[Na'na'] And relations with Saudi Arabia?

[Ramadan] Saudi relations with the Soviet Union and the PRC today are not merely a personal desire of the Saudi regime. It is something imposed by circumstances. Saudi Arabia is now bribing the Soviet Union and the latter has its eye on Saudi investments and hard currency, which could help it carry out projects and solve problems.

I believe that every person who sees these relations from a distance understands that the cause is linked to immediate interests and that it cannot create results with a tangible effect. We are not against Saudi Arabia's establishment of diplomatic relations with the Soviets. We had previously advised it to do so. However, its answer to us was always that it did not want to establish relations with a communist country.

Letter to the U.N. Secretary-General from Mr. Tariq 'Aziz, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, dated 24 January 1991

Since the imperialist United States, NATO and Zionist aggression against our country began at 0230 hours on 17 January 1991, the attacking forces have been committing heinous premeditated crimes against Iraqi citizen and against the economic, cultural, scientific and religious assets of our great people, which is one that has made a centuries-old contribution to human civilization.

On all occasions--in the course of our meeting at Amman on 31 August 1990 and during your visit to Baghdad on 11 and 12 January 1991--we have constantly indicated and have explained to you in a clear and detailed manner that the basic fact with regard to the events which preceded and followed 2 August 1990 is that the imperialist United States, NATO and Zionist alliance and its treacherous adherents among the regimes of the region have had the objective, as they continue to do, of destroying resurgent Iraq, which is pursuing a free and independent policy and which proudly rejects imperialist and Zionist hegemony over the region and over its

resources. Everything that has happened has taken place within the framework of a conspiracy hostile to the hopes of peoples for freedom, sovereignty, independence and relations of equality, which are the very principles and objectives for the achievement and defense of which the United Nations is supposed to have been established.

The deliberate and brutal attacks launched on behalf of the United Nations by the forces of the criminal Zionist-imperialist alliance on civilian economic, humanitarian, medical, cultural and religious targets and on citizens and their families in all parts of Iraq—documented examples of which are provided to you in the present letter—give cogent proof of the fact that the Governments participating in this alliance have the sole objective of taking vengeance on the proud people of Iraq and its militant leadership because of their opposition to the imperialist goals of those Governments.

It is indeed shameful for the United Nations that these premeditated crimes should be committed under the cover provided by resolutions adopted by the Security Council. The most recent of these is Security Council resolution 678 (1990), which the United States of America succeeded in having adopted by means of pressure, blackmail and bribery. The facts with respect to the receipt of bribes by State members of the Council and by leaders in those States are common knowledge.

Hundreds of millions of people in the world, in Asia, Africa and Latin America, who have suffered from the oppression and crimes of the former colonialists and the new imperialists, are today finding the so-called new international order of which the arrogant former colonialists and the new imperialists are speaking to be a dark age of intimidation and threats against those peoples aspiring to freedom and independence and fighting for relations of equality. The removal of the balancing role formerly played by the Soviet Union opens wide the way for the arrogant former colonialists and new imperialists once again to impose hegemony and intimidation, not only by the use of new and innovative methods, as is well known, but also by the old methods, namely aggression and open military occupation. What is new is that the colonialist technique as witnessed in past centuries has this time been used under the cover provided by iniquitous resolutions fabricated in the name of the United Nations which the Government of the imperialist colonialist alliance succeeded in having adopted by means of pressure, intimidation, blackmail and bribery.

The States that endorsed those resolutions for the motives indicated and you, personally, bear responsibility to history and to humankind for the heinous crimes being committed against the noble people of Iraq who are fighting for their freedom. Examples are given hereunder of the savage and premeditated acts of aggression committed by the aggressor forces between 17 and 21 January 1991.

[signed] Tariq 'Aziz,

Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs

Baghdad Governorate

17 January 1991

1. A pasteboard factory and plastic foam factory in Za'faraniyah bombed.
2. Homes in the Urdunn, Bunuk and Wahda quarters set on fire.
3. The Postal Department at Bab al-Mu'azzam set on fire and two citizens wounded.
4. A civilian vehicle set on fire near Al-Sha'b bridge.
5. The civil defense center for the Abu Ghurayb area bombed.
6. Abu Nawwas Street bombed.

18 January 1991

1. A clinic bombed; one killed and 10 wounded and four ambulances damaged.
2. The 7 Nisan residential area bombed; seven killed.
3. The residential Kasrah area bombed.
4. The vegetable-oil factory bombed.
5. Al-Sha'b sports stadium bombed.

19 January 1991

1. The Iwadiyah area bombed, resulting in the wounding of one citizen, the collapse of a restaurant and damage to neighboring shops.
2. The Ma'rifah residential district bombed; three wounded.
3. A building in the Kasrah area bombed; four civilians killed.
4. The Madinat Saddam residential area bombed; two homes damaged.
5. The Jazirat Baghdad tourist center bombed; two killed and seven wounded; one home destroyed.
6. A building under construction for the Council of ministers bombed.
7. The Al-Rashid Hotel area bombed; four homes damaged.
8. The Iraqi Museum bombed; six killed and 10 wounded; large scale damage to the museum building.

21 January 1991

1. Five killed and homes damaged in a residential neighborhood in Baghdad.
2. The Civil Defense Directorate building in the Al-Sha'b area bombed; two of the staff killed and five wounded; five vehicles damaged.

22 January 1991

1. Homes in the 52 Street area bombed; two killed and three wounded.
2. Residential neighborhoods bombed in Nuayrah, Kiyarah, the Qadisiyah quarter and the Dur al-Shuhada' quarter.
3. Madinat Saddam bombed and homes set on fire.
4. The Karradat Maryam area bombed; two killed and four wounded; four homes destroyed; a number of neighboring homes damaged.

23 January 1991

1. Residential neighborhoods in the Waziriyah area and the Amin II area bombed.

Salah al-Din Governorate

17 January 1991

1. One killed and nine wounded in the Khudayrah area of the Balad district as a result of the explosion of time-delay bombs dropped from aircraft.

21 January 1991

1. Air attack on the Biji-Qaryat al-Bujwari district, wounding six.
2. Attack on the Dur district, in the heavily populated southern region, killing 22 and wounding 33 and causing large-scale damage to 112 homes and 30 vehicles and damage to the Al-Abbasi Mosque.

3. Missile falling in a field in the Faris district, killing one woman and wounding two other citizens, one a woman.

4. The Tikrit district bombed with cluster-bombs dropped by two BRM-3A/As.

22 January 1991

1. Residential centers bombed in the town of Tikrit and the Samarra' and Biji districts.

Ninawa Governorate

19 January 1991

1. The historic St. Thomas's Church bombed and damaged.

Wasit Governorate

17 January 1991

1. Air attack on the provincial capital, killing nine and wounding nine others and damaging eight homes.

18 January 1991

1. Attack on residential neighborhoods in the city of Kut, killing a woman and wounding 29 other citizens and damaging six homes and six civilian government offices.

Babil Governorate

18 January 1991

1. Residential areas bombed in the Latifiyah sub-district; one woman wounded; a home damaged.
2. Attacks on the Musayyib district, damaging homes there.

19 January 1991

1. The provincial capital and the Musayyib, Mahmadiyah and Iskandariyah area were subjected to air attacks in which the textile plant at Hillah was damaged and two of the workers were killed and 14 wounded and homes in Mahmadiyah were damaged.

21 January 1991

1. The health center in the provincial capital bombed from the air; 24 wounded; extensive damage to the building, the Civil Defense Directorate building and neighboring homes.
2. The Tall al-Dhahab area bombed; one wounded; homes damaged.

22 January 1991

1. Residential area bombed in the Mahmadiyah and Musayyib districts and the Iskandariyah sub-district; four civilians wounded.

Anbar Governorate

19 January 1991

1. A food storage warehouse containing vegetable-oil and rice for the civilian inhabitants bombed in the Abu Ghurayb area.
2. Residential centers bombed in the Buhali area of the provincial capital; four children and two women killed; 16 others citizens wounded, including six women and five children; two homes destroyed; and a fire started.
3. The Nukhaym sub-district bombed; 25 killed; nine wounded.

20 January 1991

1. Attack on the phosphate plant at Qa'im, killing three and wounding others.
2. A warehouse containing foodstuffs, meat and vegetable-oil bombed at Ramadi; two killed and seven wounded.

21 January 1991

1. The Hit district bombed; one killed and three wounded; homes damaged and destroyed; two civilian vehicles destroyed.
2. The Azrakiyah area in the Saqlawiyah sub-district bombed; a woman killed and four other citizens wounded.
3. A home hit by a missile fired by an aircraft, killing three and wounding nine, all of them women and children.
4. A home hit by a missile fired by an aircraft, destroying the house and a civilian vehicle.
5. An infant formula factory bombed in the Abu Ghurayb area.
6. A poultry farm bombed in the provincial capital.

Qadisiyah Governorate

17 January 1991

1. Residential centers in the provincial capital bombed; four killed and 23 wounded.
2. A residential building bombed, the governorate office building, the civil defense building, a number of shops and houses and four civilian vehicles damaged and an ambulance set on fire.

19 January 1991

1. The State Vehicle Company complex bombed.
2. The food storage warehouse and flour factory bombed; damage caused; 10 killed and 22 wounded; two homes in the Mu'allimin quarter destroyed.

Muthanna Governorate

18 January 1991

1. Air attack on civilian area in the Qal'at Salih and Kahla' districts, killing four in the Ka'bi area and wounding five others.
2. The sugar factory bombed.

Najaf Governorate

18 January 1991

1. Agglomerations of nomadic Bedouin bombed in the Huwaymal area near Umm Tayyarah, 20 killed, including 12 children and 5 women.

21 January 1991

1. The Kufa cement factory bombed.
2. The water purification plant for the civilian inhabitants bombed; five killed including a woman, and 22 wounded.
3. Residential neighborhoods in the cities of Najaf and Kufa bombed; 14 killed, including four children and three women; 24 wounded, including three children and 16 women; a number of homes destroyed and damaged in the Amir quarter of Najaf, where 130 citizens were killed, and in the Al-Mutanabbi quarter of Kufa.

Dhi Qar Governorate

17 January 1991

1. Air attacks, killing two and wounding five in the Batha'-Qaryat Al Budayr area and wounding two and damaging two homes and a vehicle in the provincial capital.

18 January 1991

1. Spherical bombs dropped on the Suq al-Shuyukh and Batha' areas, killing two and wounding two.

19 January 1991

1. One child killed in the Budur area during an air attack.

Karbala' Governorate

19 January 1991

1. Residential neighborhoods bombed in the provincial capital.
2. The Karbala' cement factory bombed, causing large-scale damage.

22 January 1991

1. Another residential neighborhood bombed in the provincial capital.

Basra Governorate

17 - 19 January 1991

1. The provincial capital bombed, including area of the city Basra, Barjasiyah and Al-Asma'i and neighboring residential apartments, and Atabat Bin Ghazwan; 28 wounded; 40 shops and some homes and civilian vehicles damaged.
2. The Harithah and Assaffiyah area bombed; six killed and 11 wounded, including a child aged three; six homes, an apartment and four shops destroyed; six shops and 15 vehicles damaged.
3. The Faw district bombed; one wounded; 40 homes damaged.
4. The Qurnah district bombed; 17 killed and another 17 wounded; 12 homes destroyed; six civilian vehicles damaged.

UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS

660, 661, 662, 664, 665, 666, 667, 670, 674, 677, and 678.

RESOLUTION 660

Adopted by the Security Council at its 2932nd meeting on 2 August 1990

The Security Council,

Alarmed by the invasion of Kuwait on 2 August 1990 by the military forces of Iraq,

Determining that there exists a breach of international peace and security as regards the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait,

Acting under Articles 39 and 40 of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. **Condemns** the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait;

2. **Demands** that Iraq withdraw immediately and unconditionally all its forces to the positions in which they were located on 1 August 1990;

3. **Calls upon** Iraq and Kuwait to begin immediately intensive negotiations for the resolution of their differences and supports all efforts in this regard, and especially those of the League of Arab States;

4. **Decides** to meet again as necessary to consider further steps to ensure compliance with the present resolution.

RESOLUTION 661

Adopted by the Security Council at its 2933rd meeting on 6 August 1990

The Security Council,

Reaffirming its resolution 660 (1990) of 2 August 1990,

Deeply concerned that that resolution has not been implemented and that the invasion by Iraq of Kuwait continues with further loss of human life and material destruction,

Determined to bring the invasion and occupation of Kuwait by Iraq to an end and to restore the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Kuwait,

Noting that the legitimate Government of Kuwait has expressed its readiness to comply with resolution 660 (1990),

Mindful of its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security,

Affirming the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence, in response to the armed attack by Iraq against Kuwait, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter,

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. **Determines** that Iraq so far has failed to comply with paragraph 2 of resolution 660 (1990) and has usurped the authority of the legitimate Government of Kuwait;

2. **Decides**, as a consequence, to take the following measures to secure compliance of Iraq with paragraph 2 of resolution 660 (1990) and to restore the authority of the legitimate Government of Kuwait;

3. **Decides** that all States shall prevent:

(a) The import into their territories of all commodities and products originating in Iraq or Kuwait exported therefrom after the date of the present resolution;

(b) Any activities by their nationals or in their territories which would promote or are calculated to promote the export or transshipment of any commodities or products from Iraq or Kuwait; and any dealings by their nationals or their flag vessels or in their territories in any commodities or products originating in Iraq or Kuwait and exported therefrom after the date of the present resolution, including in particular any transfer of funds to Iraq or Kuwait for the purposes of such activities or dealings;

(c) The sale or supply by their nationals or from their territories or using their flag vessels of any commodities or products, including weapons or any other military equipment, whether or not originating in their territories but not including supplies intended strictly for medical purposes, and, in humanitarian circumstances, foodstuffs, to any person or body in Iraq or Kuwait or to any person or body for the purposes of any business carried on in or operated from Iraq or Kuwait, and any activities by their nationals or in their territories which promote or are calculated to promote such sale or supply of such commodities or products;

4. **Decides** that all States shall not make available to the Government of Iraq or to any commercial, industrial or public utility undertaking in Iraq or Kuwait, any funds or any other financial or economic resources and shall prevent their nationals and any persons within their territories from removing from their territories or otherwise making available to that Government or to any such undertaking any such funds or resources and from remitting any other funds to persons or bodies within Iraq or Kuwait, except payments exclusively for strictly medical or humanitarian purposes and, in humanitarian circumstances, foodstuffs;

5. **Calls upon** all States, including States non-members of the United Nations, to act strictly in accordance with the provisions of the present resolution notwithstanding any contract entered into or licence granted before the date of the present resolution;

6. **Decides** to establish, in accordance with rule 28 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, a Committee of the Security Council consisting of all the members of the Council, to undertake the following tasks and to report on its work

to the Council with its observations and recommendations:

(a) To examine the reports on the progress of the implementation of the present resolution which will be submitted by the Secretary-General;

(b) To seek from all States further information regarding the action taken by them concerning the effective implementation of the provisions laid down in the present resolution;

7. **Calls upon** all States to cooperate fully with the Committee in the fulfillment of its task, including supplying such information as may be sought by the Committee in pursuance of the present resolution;

8. **Requests** the Secretary-General to provide all necessary assistance to the Committee and to make the necessary arrangements in the Secretariat for the purpose;

9. **Decides** that, notwithstanding paragraphs 4 through 8 above, nothing in the present resolution shall prohibit assistance to the legitimate Government of Kuwait, and calls upon all States:

(a) To take appropriate measures to protect assets of the legitimate Government of Kuwait and its agencies;

(b) Not to recognize any regime set up by the occupying Power;

10. **Requests** the Secretary-General to report to the Council on the progress of the implementation of the present resolution, the first report to be submitted within thirty days;

11. **Decides** to keep this item on its agenda and to continue its efforts to put an early end to the invasion by Iraq.

RESOLUTION 662

Adopted by the Security Council at its 2934th meeting on 9 August 1990

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 660 (1990) and 661 (1990),

Gravely alarmed by the declaration by Iraq of a "comprehensive and eternal merger" with Kuwait,

Demanding, once again, that Iraq withdraw immediately and unconditionally all its forces to the positions in which they were located on 1 August 1990,

Determined to bring the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq to an end and to restore the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Kuwait,

Determined also to restore the authority of the legitimate Government of Kuwait,

1. **Decides** that annexation of Kuwait by Iraq under any form and whatever pretext has no legal validity, and is considered null and void;

2. **Calls upon** all States, international organizations and specialized agencies not to recognize that annexation, and to refrain from any action or

dealing that might be interpreted as an indirect recognition of the annexation;

3. **Further demands** that Iraq rescind its actions purporting to annex Kuwait;

4. **Decides** to keep this item on its agenda and to continue its efforts to put an early end to the occupation.

RESOLUTION 664

Adopted by the Security Council at its 2937th meeting on 18 August 1990

The Security Council,

Recalling the Iraqi invasion and purported annexation of Kuwait and resolutions 660, 661 and 662,

Deeply concerned for the safety and well being of third state nationals in Iraq and Kuwait,

Recalling the obligations of Iraq in this regard under international law,

Welcoming the efforts of the Secretary-General to pursue urgent consultations with the Government of Iraq following the concern and anxiety expressed by the members of the Council on 17 August 1990,

Acting under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter:

1. **Demands** that Iraq permit and facilitate the immediate departure from Kuwait and Iraq of the nationals of third countries and grant immediate and continuing access of consular officials to such nationals;

2. **Further demands** that Iraq take no action to jeopardize the safety, security or health of such nationals;

3. **Reaffirms** its decision in resolution 662 (1990) that annexation of Kuwait by Iraq is null and void, and therefore demands that the government of Iraq rescind its orders for the closure of diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait and the withdrawal of the immunity of their personnel, and refrain from any such actions in the future;

4. **Requests** the Secretary-General to report to the Council on compliance with this resolution at the earliest possible time.

RESOLUTION 665

Adopted by the Security Council at its 2938th meeting on 25 August 1990

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990), 662 (1990) and 664 (1990) and demanding their full and immediate implementation,

Having decided in resolution 661 (1990) to impose economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

Determined to bring an end to the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq which imperils the existence of a

Member State and to restore the legitimate authority, and the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Kuwait which requires the speedy implementation of the above resolutions,

Deploing the loss of innocent life stemming from the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and determined to prevent further such losses,

Gravely alarmed that Iraq continues to refuse to comply with resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990), 662 (1990) and 664 (1990) and in particular at the conduct of the Government of Iraq in using Iraqi flag vessels to export oil,

1. **Calls upon** those Member States cooperating with the Government of Kuwait which are deploying maritime forces to the area to use such measures commensurate to the specific circumstances as may be necessary under the authority of the Security Council to halt all inward and outward maritime shipping in order to inspect and verify their cargoes and destinations and to ensure strict implementation of the provisions related to such shipping laid down in resolution 661 (1990);

2. **Invites** Member States accordingly to cooperate as may be necessary to ensure compliance with the provisions of resolution 661 (1990) with maximum use of political and diplomatic measures, in accordance with paragraph 1 above;

3. **Requests** all States to provide in accordance with the Charter such assistance as may be required by the States referred to in paragraph 1 of this resolution;

4. **Further requests** the States concerned to coordinate their actions in pursuit of the above paragraphs of this resolution using as appropriate mechanisms of the Military Staff Committee and after consultation with the Secretary-General to submit reports to the Security Council and its Committee established under resolution 661 (1990) to facilitate the monitoring of the implementation of this resolution;

5. **Decides** to remain actively seized of the matter.

RESOLUTION 666

Canada, Finland, France, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America: draft resolution on 13 September 1990

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolution 661 (1990), paragraphs 3 (c) and 4 of which apply, except in humanitarian circumstances, to foodstuffs,

Recognizing that circumstances may arise in which it will be necessary for foodstuffs to be supplied to the civilian population in Iraq or Kuwait in order to relieve human suffering,

Noting that in this respect the Committee established under paragraph 6 of that resolution has received communications from several Member States,

Emphasizing that it is for the Security Council, alone or acting through the Committee, to determine whether humanitarian circumstances have arisen,

Deeply concerned that Iraq has failed to comply with its obligations under Security Council resolution 664 (1990) in respect of the safety and well-being of third State nationals, and reaffirming that Iraq retains full responsibility in this regard under international humanitarian law including, where applicable, the Fourth Geneva Convention,

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. **Decides** that in order to make the necessary determination whether or not for the purposes of paragraph 3 (c) and paragraph 4 of resolution 661 (1990) humanitarian circumstances have arisen, the Committee shall keep the situation regarding foodstuffs in Iraq and Kuwait under constant review;

2. **Expects** Iraq to comply with its obligations under Security Council resolution 664 (1990) in respect of third State nationals and reaffirms that Iraq remains fully responsible for their safety and well-being in accordance with international humanitarian law including, where applicable, the Fourth Geneva Convention;

RESOLUTION 667

Adopted by the Security Council at its 2940th meeting on 16 September 1990

The Security Council,

Reaffirming its resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990), 662 (1990), 664 (1990), 665 (1990) and 666 (1990),

Recalling the Vienna Conventions of 18 April 1961 on diplomatic relations and of 24 April 1963 on consular relations, to both of which Iraq is a party,

Considering that the decision of Iraq to order the closure of diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait and to withdraw the immunity and privileges of these missions and their personnel is contrary to the decisions of the Security Council, the international Conventions mentioned above and international law,

Deeply concerned that Iraq, notwithstanding the decisions of the Security Council and the provisions of the Conventions mentioned above, has committed acts of violence against diplomatic missions and their personnel in Kuwait,

Outraged at recent violations by Iraq of diplomatic premises in Kuwait and at the abduction of personnel enjoying diplomatic immunity and foreign nationals who were present in these premises,

Considering that the above actions by Iraq constitute aggressive acts and a flagrant violation of its international obligations which strike at the root of the conduct of international relations in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations,

Recalling that Iraq is fully responsible for any use of violence against foreign nationals or against any

diplomatic or consular mission in Kuwait or its personnel,

Determined to ensure respect for its decisions and for Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations,

Further considering that the grave nature of Iraq's actions, which constitute a new escalation of its violations of international law, obliges the Council not only to express its immediate reaction but also to consult urgently to take further concrete measures to ensure Iraq's compliance with the Council's resolutions,

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. **Strongly condemns** aggressive acts perpetrated by Iraq against diplomatic premises and personnel in Kuwait, including the abduction of foreign nationals who were present in those premises;

2. **Demands** the immediate release of those foreign nationals as well as all nationals mentioned in resolution 664 (1990);

3. **Further demands** that Iraq immediately and fully comply with its international obligations under resolutions 660 (1990), 662 (1990) and 664 (1990) of the Security Council, the Vienna Conventions on diplomatic and consular relations and international law;

4. **Further demands** that Iraq immediately protect the safety and well-being of diplomatic and consular personnel and premises in Kuwait and in Iraq and take no action to hinder the diplomatic and consular missions in the performance of their functions, including access to their nationals and the protection of their person and interests;

5. **Reminds** all States that they are obliged to observe strictly resolutions 661 (1990), 662 (1990), 664 (1990), 665 (1990) and 666 (1990);

6. **Decides** to consult urgently to take further concrete measures as soon as possible, under Chapter VII of the Charter, in response to Iraq's continued violation of the Charter, of resolutions of the Council and of international law.

RESOLUTION 670

Adopted by the Security Council at its 2943rd meeting on 25 September 1990

The Security Council,

Reaffirming its resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990), 662 (1990), 664 (1990), 665 (1990), 666 (1990), and 667 (1990),

Condemning Iraq's continued occupation of Kuwait, its failure to rescind its actions and end its purported annexation and its holding of third State nationals against their will, in flagrant violation of resolutions 660 (1990), 662 (1990), 664 (1990) and 667 (1990) and of international humanitarian law,

Condemning further the treatment by Iraqi forces of Kuwaiti nationals, including measures to force them to leave their own country and mistreatment

of persons and property in Kuwait in violation of international law,

Noting with grave concern the persistent attempts to evade the measures laid down in resolution 661 (1990),

Further noting that a number of States have limited the number of Iraqi diplomatic and consular officials in their countries and that others are planning to do so,

Determined to ensure by all necessary means the strict and complete application of the measures laid down in resolution 661 (1990),

Determined to ensure respect for its decisions and the provisions of Articles 25 and 48 of the Charter of the United Nations,

Affirming that any acts of the Government of Iraq which are contrary to the above-mentioned resolutions or to Articles 25 or 48 of the Charter of the United Nations, such as Decree No. 377 of the Revolution Command Council of Iraq of 16 September 1990, are null and void,

Reaffirming its determination to ensure compliance with Security Council resolutions by maximum use of political and diplomatic means,

Welcoming the Secretary-General's use of his good offices to advance a peaceful solution based on the relevant Security Council resolutions and noting with appreciation his continuing efforts to this end,

Underlining to the Government of Iraq that its continued failure to comply with the terms of resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990), 662 (1990), 664 (1990), 666 (1990) and 667 (1990) could lead to further serious action by the Council under the Charter of the United Nations, including under Chapter VII,

Recalling the provisions of Article 103 of the Charter of the United Nations,

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. **Calls upon** all States to carry out their obligations to ensure strict and complete compliance with resolution 661 (1990) and in particular paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 thereof;

2. **Confirms** that resolution 661 (1990) applies to all means of transport, including aircraft;

3. **Decides** that all States, notwithstanding the existence of any rights or obligations conferred or imposed by any international agreement or any contract entered into or any licence or permit granted before the date of the present resolution, shall deny permission to any aircraft to take off from their territory if the aircraft would carry any cargo to or from Iraq or Kuwait other than food in humanitarian circumstances, subject to authorization by the Council or the Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) and in accordance with resolution 666 (1990), or supplies intended strictly for medical purposes or solely for UNIMOG;

4. **Decides** further that all States shall deny permission to any aircraft destined to land in Iraq or Kuwait, whatever its State of registration, to overfly its territory unless:

(a) The aircraft lands at an airfield designated by that State outside Iraq or Kuwait in order to permit its inspection to ensure that there is no cargo on board in violation of resolution 661 (1990) or the present resolution, and for this purpose the aircraft may be detained for as long as necessary; or

(b) The particular flight has been approved by the Committee established by resolution 661 (1990); or

(c) The flight is certified by the United Nations as solely for the purposes of UNHMOG;

5. **Decides** that each State shall take all necessary measures to ensure that any aircraft registered in its territory or operated by an operator who has his principal place of business or permanent residence in its territory complies with the provisions of resolution 661 (1990) and the present resolution;

6. **Decides further** that all States shall notify in a timely fashion the Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) of any flight between its territory and Iraq or Kuwait to which the requirement to land in paragraph 4 above does not apply, and the purpose for such a flight;

7. **Calls upon** all States to cooperate in taking such measures as may be necessary, consistent with international law, including the Chicago Convention, to ensure the effective implementation of the provisions of resolution 661 (1990) or the present resolution;

8. **Calls upon** all States to detain any ships of Iraqi registry which enter their ports and which are being or have been used in violation of resolution 661 (1990), or to deny such ships entrance to their ports except in circumstances recognized under international law as necessary to safeguard human life;

9. **Reminds** all States of their obligations under resolution 661 (1990) with regard to the freezing of Iraqi assets, and the protection of the assets of the legitimate Government of Kuwait and its agencies, located within their territory and to report to the Committee established under resolution 661 (1990) regarding those assets;

10. **Calls upon** all States to provide to the Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) information regarding the action taken by them to implement the provisions laid down in the present resolution;

11. **Affirms** that the United Nations Organization, the specialized agencies and other international organizations in the United Nations system are required to take such measures as may be necessary to give effect to the terms of resolution 661 (1990) and this resolution;

12. **Decides** to consider, in the event of evasion of the provisions of resolution 661 (1990) or of the present resolution by a State or its nationals or through its territory, measures directed at the State in question to prevent such evasion;

13. **Reaffirms** that the Fourth Geneva Convention applies to Kuwait and that as a High Contracting Party to the Convention Iraq is bound to

comply fully with all its terms and in particular is liable under the Convention in respect of the grave breaches committed by it, as are individuals who commit or order the commission of grave breaches.

RESOLUTION 674

29 October 1990

The Security Council,

Recalling its Resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990), 662 (1990), 664 (1990), 665 (1990), 666 (1990), 667 (1990), and 670 (1990),

Stressing the urgent need for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all Iraqi forces from Kuwait, for the restoration of Kuwait's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and of the authority of its legitimate Government,

Condemning the actions by the Iraqi authorities and occupying forces to take third-state nationals, hostage and to mistreat and oppress Kuwait and third-state nationals, and the other actions reported to the Council such as the destruction of Kuwaiti demographic records, forced departure of Kuwaitis and relocation of population in Kuwait and the unlawful destruction and seizure of public and private property in Kuwait including hospital supplies and equipment, in violation of the decisions of this Council, the Charter of the United Nations, the Fourth Geneva Convention, the Vienna Conventions on Diplomatic and Consular Relations and international law,

Expressing grave alarm over the situation of national of third states in Kuwait and Iraq, including the personnel of the diplomatic and consular missions of such states,

Reaffirming that the Fourth Geneva Convention applies to Kuwait and that as a high contracting party to the convention, Iraq is bound to comply fully with all its terms and in particular is liable under the convention in respect of the grave breaches committed by it, as are individuals who commit or order the commission of grave breaches,

Recalling the efforts of the Secretary General concerning the safety and well-being of third-state nationals in Iraq and Kuwait,

Deeply concerned at the economic cost and at the loss and suffering caused to individuals in Kuwait and Iraq as a result of the invasion and occupation of Kuwait by Iraq,

Acting under Charter VII of the United Nations Charter,

Reaffirming the goal of the international community of maintaining international peace and security by seeking to resolve international disputes and conflicts through peaceful means,

Recalling also the important role that the United Nations and its Secretary General have played in the peaceful solution of disputes and conflicts in

conformity with the provisions of the United Nations Charter,

Alarmed by the dangers of the present crisis caused by the Iraqi invasion and occupation of Kuwait, directly threatening international peace and security, and seeking to avoid any further worsening of the situation,

Calling upon Iraq to comply with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, in particular Resolutions 660 (1990), 662 (1990), and 664 (1990),

Reaffirming its determination to insure compliance by Iraq with the Security Council resolutions by maximum use of political and diplomatic means,

[A] 1. **Demands** that the Iraqi authorities and occupying forces immediately cease and desist from taking third-state nationals hostage, and mistreating and oppressing Kuwaiti and third-state nationals, and from any other actions such as those reported to the Council and described above, violating the decisions of this Council, the Charter of the United Nations, the Fourth Geneva Convention, the Vienna Conventions on Diplomatic and Consular Relations and international law;

2. **Invites** states to collect substantiated information in their possession or submitted to them on the grave breaches by Iraq as per paragraph 1 above and to make this information available to the Council;

3. **Reaffirms** its demand that Iraq immediately fulfill its obligations to third-state nationals in Kuwait and Iraq, including the personnel of diplomatic and consular missions, under the Charter, the Fourth Geneva Convention, the Vienna Conventions of Diplomatic and Consular Relations, general principles of international law and the relevant resolutions of the Council;

4. **Reaffirms further** its demand that Iraq permit and facilitate the immediate departure from Kuwait and Iraq of those third-state nationals, including diplomatic and consular personnel, who wish to leave;

5. **Demands** that Iraq insure the immediate access to food, water and basic services necessary to the protection and well-being of Kuwaiti nationals and of the nationals of third states in Kuwait and Iraq, including the personnel of diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait;

6. **Reaffirms** its demand that Iraq immediately protect the safety and well-being of diplomatic and consular personnel and premises in Kuwait and in Iraq, take no action to hinder these diplomatic and consular missions in the performance of their functions, including access to their nationals and the protection of their person and interests and rescind its orders for the closure of diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait and the withdrawal of the immunity of their personnel;

7. **Requests** the Secretary General, in the context of the continuing exercise of his good offices

concerning the safety and well-being of third-state nationals in Iraq and Kuwait, to seek to achieve the objectives of paragraphs 4, 5 and 6, and in particular the provisions of food, water, and basic services to Kuwaiti nationals and to the diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait and the evacuation of third-state nationals;

8. **Reminds** Iraq that under international law it is liable for any loss, damage or injury arising in regard to Kuwait and third states, and their nationals and corporations, as a result of the invasion and illegal occupation of Kuwait by Iraq;

9. **Invites** states to collect relevant information regarding their claims and those of their nationals and corporations, for restitution or financial compensation by Iraq with a view to such arrangements as may be established in accordance with international law;

10. **Requires** that Iraq comply with the provisions of the present resolution and its previous resolutions, failing which the Council will need to take further measures under the Charter;

11. **Decides** to remain actively and permanently seized of the matter until Kuwait has regained its independence and peace has been restored in conformity with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council.

[B] 12. **Reposes** its trust in the Secretary General to make available his good offices and, as he considers appropriate, to pursue them and undertake diplomatic efforts in order to reach a peaceful solution to the crisis caused by the Iraqi invasion and occupation of Kuwait on the basis of Security Council Resolutions 660 (1990), 662 (1990), and 664 (1990), and calls on all states, both those in the region and others, to pursue on this basis their efforts to this end, in conformity with the Charter, in order to improve the situation and restore peace, security and stability;

13. **Requests** the Secretary General to report to the Security Council on the results of his good offices and diplomatic efforts.

RESOLUTION 677

28 November 1990

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 660 (1990) of 2 August 1990, 662 (1990) of 9 August 1990 and 674 (1990) of 29 October 1990,

Reiterating its concern for the suffering caused to individuals in Kuwait as a result of the invasion and occupation of Kuwait by Iraq,

Gravely concerned at the ongoing attempt by Iraq to alter the demographic composition of the population of Kuwait and to destroy the civil records maintained by the legitimate Government of Kuwait,

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. **Condemns** the attempts by Iraq to alter the demographic composition of the population of Kuwait and to destroy the civil records maintained by the legitimate Government of Kuwait;

2. **Mandates** the Secretary-General to take custody of a copy of the population register of Kuwait, the authenticity of which has been certified by the legitimate Government of Kuwait and which covers the population up to 1 August 1990;

3. **Requests** the Secretary-General to establish, in co-operation with the legitimate Government of Kuwait, an Order of Rules and Regulations governing access to and use of the said copy of the population register.

RESOLUTION 678

29 November 1990

The Security Council,

Recalling and Reaffirming its Resolutions 660 (1990), 662 (1990), 664 (1990), 665 (1990), 666 (1990), 667 (1990), 669 (1990), 670 (1990), 674 (1990), 677 (1990),

Noting that, despite all efforts by the United Nations, Iraq refuses to comply with its obligation to implement Resolution 660 (1990) and subsequent resolutions, in flagrant contempt of the Council,

Mindful of its duties and responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance and preservation of international peace and security,

Determined to secure full compliance with its decisions,

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. **Demands** that Iraq comply fully with Resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant resolutions and decides, while maintaining all its decisions, to allow Iraq one final opportunity, as a pause of good will, to do so;

2. **Authorizes** member states cooperating with the Government of Kuwait, unless Iraq on or before Jan 15, 1991, fully implements, as set forth in paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions, to use all necessary means to uphold and implement the Security Council Resolution 660 and all subsequent relevant Resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;

3. **Requests** all states to provide appropriate support for the actions undertaken in pursuance of paragraph 2 of this resolution; and

4. **Requests** the states concerned to keep the Council regularly informed on the progress of actions undertaken pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of this resolution;

5. **Decides** to remain seized of the matter.

Appendix: Some Information on Iraq

The **Iraqi Republic** is composed of 19 Governorates (including 3 in Kurdish Autonomous Region)

Population: 20 million (including 19th Governorate)

median age: 15. fertility: 7.3 children average
religions: Sunni, Shi'i, Christian, Jewish.

literacy: 97%

compulsory schooling, military conscription,
free university education,
free health care and hospitalization,
Provisional Constitution issued in 1968.

A new constitution is currently being prepared.

President: Saddam Hussein

Vice-President: Taha Muhiuddin Maruf.

Revolution Command Council

Chair: Saddam Hussein

Vice-Chair: Izzat Ibrahim

Secretary-General: Khaled Abd al-Moneim Rashid

Members: Taha Yassin Ramadan, Sa'adoun Shaker
Mahmoud, Tariq Mikhayl 'Aziz, Hassan Ali Nassar al-
Amiri, Dr. Sa'adoun Hammadi, Taha Mohieddin
Maruf

Council of Ministers

President and Prime Minister: Saddam Hussein

First Deputy Prime Minister: Taha Yassin Ramadan

Deputy Prime Minister: Dr. Sa'adoun Hammadi

Deputy Prime Minister & Minister of Foreign Affairs:
Tariq 'Aziz

Minister of Defense: Saadi Tuma Abbas Juburi

Minister of Transport and Communications:

Head of Presidential Cabinet:

Ahmad Hussein as-Samarrai

Minister of the Interior:

Samir Muhammad Abd al-Wahab Ash-Shaykhali

Minister of Education: Abd al-Qadir Izzudin Hammudi

Minister of Higher Education and Scientific Research:

Dr. Mundhir Ibrahim

Minister of Youth Affairs:

Abd al-Fattah Muhammad Amin.

Minister of Justice: Akram Abd al-Qadir Ali

Minister of Housing and Construction:

Taher Muhammad Hassoun al-Marzouk

Minister of Planning: Samal Majid Faraj.

Minister of Health: Raya al-Jazairi

Minister of Oil: Hussein Kamel Hassan

Minister of Trade and Finance:

Muhammad Mahdi Salih

Minister of Agriculture and Irrigation:

Minister of Culture and Information:

Latif Nasif al-Jasim.

Minister of Labor and Social Affairs:

Umeed Madhat Mubarak

Minister of Religious Endowments / Religious Affairs:
Abdulla Fadel 'Abbas.

Minister of Local Government: Ali Hassan al-Hajid

Minister of Industry and Military Industrialization:

Hussein Kamel Majid

Minister of State for Foreign Affairs:

Mohammed Sa'eed al-Sahhaf

Minister of State for Military Affairs

Minister of State at the President's Office:

Hashim Aqrabi Subhi

Minister of Internal Security: Sa'adoun Shaker

Ministers of State:

Advisers to the President: Subhi Yasin Khudair, Abd

al-Ghani Abd al-Ghafur, Samir Muhammad Abd al-

Wahhab, Abd al-Hasan Rahi Fir'awn, Sa'adi Mahdi

Salih, Mazban Kadr Hadi, Khaled Abd al-Moneim

Chief of Staff: General Hussein Rashid

Commander of the elite Republican Guard:

General Iyad Khalifa Rawi

Air Force Advisor: General Hamid Shahban

Air Defense Commander:

General Muzahim Saab Hassan

Arab Ba'th Socialist Party Intelligence Service Chief:

Sabawi

Legislature: National Assembly:

250 elected members (including 33 women)

Speaker of the National Assembly: Saadi Mahdi Salih.

Kurdish Legislative Council with 57 elected members.

Chairman: Ahmad 'Abd al-Qadir an-Naqshabandi.

Political Organizations:

Arab Ba'th Socialist Party,

Kurdistan Democratic Party,

Kurdistan Revolutionary Party

Governor of the 19th Governorate (Kuwait):

'Aziz Salih al-Numan

Iraqi Ambassador to the U.S.:

Mohamed Sadiq al-Mashat

Iraqi Permanent Representative to the U.N. New York:

Abdul Amir al-Anbari

Iraqi Representative to U.N. in Geneva:

Barzan Tikriti

U.S. Ambassador to Iraq (before August 1990):

April Catherine Glaspie

U.S. Acting Ambassador to Iraq at present

(former Charge d'Affairs): Joseph C. Wilson IV.

Arabic on back cover by Fred Moore:

BRING FORTH PEACE, JUSTICE,
AND RECONCILIATION
BETWEEN PEOPLE & NATIONS